

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

VOL. III

JULY, 1917

No. 3

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH AT GRINNELL

J. P. RYAN
Grinnell College

TO ORGANIZE and name a department of speech is largely a local problem. The results worked out at Grinnell during the last dozen years are suitable only for Grinnell. And here nothing has been completed, but is ever changing. Our findings are of little value to others. As a rule each one should stay home, mind one's own business, and work in one's own garden. But this rule is only general and should not be too closely followed, else there would be little change in academic and professional standards. It is well to know what others are doing. It is courteous to answer the repeated requests for information about one's work. Finally it is but fair to give thanks to those who gave freely of advice and information. To all such goes gratitude. Those who find here some of their pet ideas will be well pleased; others may rest assured their ideas were equally good, but local conditions were not fit for such good ideas.

The most interesting reading which came under the eyes of the committee was on the question of name. To all teachers of public speaking, the question of name acts like the proverbial red rag. Much feeling is sure to be aroused over titles. Each one seems to have a strong personal reaction to particular phrases. A review of the questionnaire on title and names would be very interesting even if not very profitable. What follows here on name is merely the findings of the committee after most of the interest and much of the persuasion have been squeezed out.

The same treatment has been accorded to the other topics of scope, of purpose, and correlation. Only the adoptions are given; the arguments are omitted. This paper, then, contains rather a prosaic, perhaps dogmatic, statement of the scope, the purpose, the correlation, the name, and the list of courses of the department of speech in Grinnell College.

SCOPE

This department is devoted to the science and the art of speech. Its work, therefore, is in the fields of speaking, reading, and dramatic art. All three fields are cultivated as speech sciences and speech arts.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this department is to make a greater recognition of the spoken word in education; to give more emphasis to the peculiar academic disciplines of the speech sciences; to realize more fully the educational values in the study of the speech arts. As the goal of science is explanation, one of the great purposes is to discover knowledge of speech; and as the goal of art is action, so the other great purpose is studying the art of speaking well. More specifically the purpose permeating the different courses in this department are: to develop the ability to speak well; to find out knowledge of speech; to impart knowledge of social relations of speech; to develop the ability to think in terms of social life and culture; to study the vocal interpretation of the printed page and to realize the educational values in dramatic art. Through all these purposes runs the dominating purpose of our college, for this department is only one of the several differentials in realizing the purpose of a liberal arts college. The purpose of this department is best revealed in the purpose of Grinnell College.

ORGANIZATION

The department of speech is organized as an independent, separate department, but closely correlated with other departments, especially with the department of English. It is true the department of English needs the department of speech more than the speech needs the English, nevertheless the welfare of the speech work demands separate organization. Effective work and

healthy growth will hardly be realized until the departments of speaking are organized on their own basis. And yet those who are pleading for complete separation are as much in error as those who would leave the work of speaking buried in the department of English, Economics, or Logic. Separation without correlation spells death. This department was organized upon the two principles of complete separation, close correlation.

CORRELATION

As all the departments are aiming at the same purpose as the whole college, so the purpose of each department is best realized by closest correlation with one another. Correlation is working together for the same academic purpose. This department is peculiarly fitted to bring the departments together. Though there is a very distinct field of knowledge and many problems therein waiting for solution, yet the chief business of a speech department in a liberal arts college is ready service in the other fields of knowledge. Perhaps the greatest service speaking can do in our colleges today is in bringing the departments together, and thus help in eliminating the evil of departmental education. The drawing the parts of the college together is being worked out along three lines: 1. on what courses are offered, 2. on the way the courses are given, 3. on the credit given for the course. Along the first line a general departmental policy is secured and some correlation maintained through the Committee on Correlation. This committee, consisting of five members, has one member from each of the departments concerned. Along the second line, the content and conduct of the course, some correlation is secured by an exchange of syllabi. "Some correlation" may seem rather indefinite; but we have found when a sympathetic understanding of what is being attempted in other courses is reached there is apt to be a good deal of quiet correlation. Finally correlation is secured by an exchange of cards. In the statement of some of the courses, a note is appended saying: "Part of the credit for this course is based upon the student's speech in other departments." A card is printed for every student registered in the course in speaking. These cards are given to all those teachers in whose classes the same students are registered. In the other classes the student's speech is noted and recorded upon the

card. These cards are collected twice during the semester. In this way the student's credit for the course in speaking is partly based upon his speech in other departments. Correlation is one of the most vital problems of college life. Our department should do its bit. The work of correlation may be aided along these lines of the determination, the conduct, and the credit for the course.

With the department of English still closer relations are maintained. These relationships are due largely to the most cordial feelings and clear understanding of each other's work and worth. Courses are planned together, or given together and general standards maintained. In the department of English, to register for "The Teacher's Course," the student must also register for the course with the same title in the department of Speech. The classes are combined, the instructor from the English department takes the class for part of the semester, the instructor from the department of Speech takes the class for the remainder. In composition certain courses are scheduled in both departments. At present plans are under way for the correlation of the courses in literature. In every possible way close and cordial relations are being built up.

NAME

As was stated above though the racy reading was upon the name, yet because these remarks were nearly all personal reactions it was hardly worth while to restate these emotional outbursts. Here follows then a brief statement of the reasons which caused us to reject certain names and finally to adopt the present title. Rhetoric and Oratory were too old, pretentious, and inaccurate. Public Speaking was too narrow, indefinite, and easily perverted. The modifier "public" is of uncertain significance. The meaning of the whole term is changing rapidly. Oral English was quite misleading. Hardly anyone but the Lord and the user of the term has a clear concept of its meaning, and sometimes one of these is evidently in doubt. With some Oral English suggests merely an oral parallel of the work of the English department; with others it suggests a kind of elementary public speaking, or that part of speaking which should be done in the high school. One good teacher said: "Oral English is the

name of that thing taught by teachers of English who know little about speaking." Finally Oral English was discarded because it did not indicate or suggest the fields of speech defects, and speech culture. Oral is not a desirable word from the point of view of derivation or usage. The problems of speech are no more English than French or Russian. Interpreting a French poem or giving a Greek play quite as properly concerns the department of Speech as interpreting an English poem or giving an English play. Speech Arts and Elocution were rejected because of their connotations. The department of Speech was finally adopted because it was old, stable, short, well known, definite, extensive, and academically acceptable. In the naming of departments many American colleges have followed the principle of "the field of knowledge," or of "social activity." Under either of these principles the word speech is equally acceptable, for it may denote a definite field of academic study with definite problems, or as Professor Woolbert calls them "problems in speech science," and at the same time connote speech making; or under the principle of "social activity" the word speech readily denotes the great work of speech culture and all the informal and formal speech-making, and at the same time connotes a field for academic research. Withal the term speech seemed best. In the last analysis the best name is the one which most clearly marks off the field, stirs up the least feeling, gives the largest opportunity for work, and draws the workers closer together. The simple word speech seemed to serve our purpose best. We would not argue for the word. Is there not something to the effect that the word dies, but the spirit lives? In the spirit let us live!

COURSES

The courses here given are much the same as in other institutions. The only exception is the requirement of studio work. In this department to receive credit for a course three kinds of work must be done, class work, outside class work, and studio work. The class work consists of the regular work of the recitation period, outside class work covers the reports, readings, and study done out of recitation period. The studio work somewhat similar to the laboratory work comprises the technical practice and rehearsals done under the personal direction of the

instructor. In general a course with two hours' credit will necessitate one hour's studio work.

The courses in public speaking are planned to teach pupils to think clearly and to speak well, in order that each student may have in a larger measure self-expression and self-realization. The courses are:

- | | | |
|--------|----|--|
| Speech | 1. | Voice Training, 2 hours. |
| " | 2. | Practical Public Speaking, 2 hours. |
| " | 3. | Forms of Public Address, 3 hours. |
| " | 4. | Argumentative Address, 3 hours. |
| " | 5. | Debating, 2 hours. |
| " | 6. | Vocational Speaking—Teachers, 2 hours. |
| " | 7. | " " —Minister, 2 hours. |
| " | 8. | " " —Business man, 2 hrs. |
| " | 9. | Speech Arts and Sciences, 2 hours. |

The courses in reading are planned with the motive of making reading a useful and a fine art. The purpose is to realize the educational values in the printed page. The courses are:

- | | | |
|--------|-----|---|
| Speech | 10. | Essentials of Interpretation, 2 hours. |
| " | 11. | Vocal Interpretation of Literature, 2 hours. |
| " | 12. | Vocal Interpretation of the Poetry of
Browning, 2 hours. |

In dramatic art the underlying principle is presentation. To study drama without presentation is like studying music without instrumentation. In all courses the aims are the educational values, and the cultural development through knowledge, appreciation, and creative self-expression. As yet the only courses offered are:

- | | | |
|--------|-----|-----------------------------------|
| Speech | 13. | Interpretation of Drama, 3 hours. |
| " | 14. | Presentation of Drama, 2 hours. |

As was stated in the beginning, so let it be repeated in the end: This brief account of the work at Grinnell is given because it has been asked for again and again; and not with any intention of featuring this work, nor any hope of persuading others to accept our findings. Our problems are not your problems. (Ergo thanks.) What meets our local conditions might not meet yours. Anyway nothing has been finally settled; every-

thing is changing. With the present light and present condition this account indicates the way we are going. In building up this department as more light and more money come from different sources, this program is likely to be changed though the general aims remain the same. For more light and more money, let us hope!

VOICE TRAINING IN NORMAL SCHOOLS

LOUSSENE G. ROUSSEAU

Kalamazoo Normal School

FOR some time it has been generally recognized, at least in educational circles, that the American voice is badly in need of training. When one of our leading periodicals finds a good voice so unusual in this country as to necessitate the following comment upon some entertainers, "Their enunciation has a clearness and purity that in America is startling";¹ and when one of our leading newspapers,² after commenting upon the clear voices of these same entertainers, says, "There is something wrong about a system that produces ragtime and peacock voices," we can hardly fail to realize the necessity of doing something to help matters. But when such a magazine as *Life* publishes this criticism, "The annual visit of the Yale dramatic boys with their four playlets—by no means bad entertainment, all things considered—only emphasizes again that notable American defect, bad speech," it is quite evident that we are confronted with a problem that concerns the whole American nation.

An investigation of the curriculum, not only of the elementary and secondary schools, but also of colleges and universities, shows that while English grammar, English composition, and English literature are taught everywhere, the way English should sound when it is spoken is seldom even hinted at. This failure of education to provide for the training of the simplest and most natural means of self-expression has led to the American voice.

The importance of work in the correction of voice defects in the grades has been made startlingly clear by speech surveys, conducted by capable men, in some of our large cities. Probably the most interesting is that made by Dr. Wallin in St. Louis.³ Out of 89,075 children examined, 2,494 were found to be suffering from very serious defects in speech. Only the worst defects were counted, and those only where the teacher absolutely un-

¹ *Harper's Weekly*, January 3, 1914.

² *Springfield Republican*.

³ Dr. Wallin, "A Census of Speech Defectives," *School and Society*, February 5, 1916, p. 213.

trained in the diagnosis of speech defects, agreed that the voice was wrong.

Another interesting survey is that made by Conradi.⁴ Eighty-seven thousand, four hundred forty children in Kansas City, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Louisville, Albany, and Springfield were examined; of this number, over 2,000 were found to have serious voice defects.

In a survey of the school children of Madison, Wisconsin, last year,⁵ Dr. Blanton, of the University of Wisconsin, found that nearly 150 children, out of a total of 4,862, had serious voice defects, chiefly stuttering, lisping, and indistinct speech. Working out his report very carefully, Dr. Blanton found that the greatest per cent of vocal defects was in the first grade. Six and four tenths per cent of the cases reported were in the kindergarten, 11.05% in the first grade, and then the per cent decreased until the eighth grades reported only 2.65%. The large number of speech defects found in the first grade, he concludes, is due to four causes:

1. The beginning of formal study.
2. The breaking of home associations.
3. Change in dentition.
4. Study of reading.

Another very significant fact brought out by this survey is that the children who were retarded, that is, two or more years behind their grades—and those who were diagnosed as mental defectives, were to a large extent the children with the most serious voice defects. If it is possible, from this observation, to make any connection between voice defects and mental defects, as would seem to be the case, the problem is a still more serious one.

The conclusions reached by Dr. Blanton through his investigations are as follows:

1. Five per cent more children than are recorded in most surveys are suffering from speech defects.
2. Speech defects relate very closely to feeble-minded and mentally defective children.

⁴Conradi, "Speech Development in the Child," *Pedagogical Seminar*, Vol. II, p. 365.

⁵Dr. Blanton, "A Survey of Speech Defects," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, December, 1916, p. 582.

3. Teachers should know anatomy and physiology of the speech mechanism, and something of abnormal psychology.

That this work is becoming very important is evidenced by the fact that within the last three years, most of the leading educational journals in the United States have discussed the problem very seriously, and have made various suggestions as to its solution.⁶

Last year, the National Council of Teachers of English held a special conference on speech defects, under the leadership of Mrs. M. Scripture of New York, and the importance of the work was stressed in all the sections. The same National Council of Teachers of English has recently organized a National Speech League, the members of which are not in speech work. Such activity, outside the circle of professional teachers of speech, is bound to have a far-reaching effect.

Within recent years, many of our state universities have established courses in voice-training, and many summer school courses in oral English have been added to meet the demand for teachers who are trained to correct spoken English.

In certain states—California, New Jersey, Alabama, West Virginia, Kansas, and New York, especially—definite action has been taken, and the speech work there is becoming systematized.

The newly organized speech clinic of New York City, under the direction of Frederick Martin,⁷ and the University of Wisconsin speech clinic, with Dr. Smiley Blanton in charge, are examples of the work now being done.

We find, then, that the field has been investigated, but the problem has not been solved in any sense; nor **will** it be solved until school boards and state boards of education can be brought to see the commercial loss involved in allowing speech defects to go untreated. The very definite relation between speech defects and the earning of a livelihood is something still to be learned. When school boards come to realize that the number of professions closed to lispers, stammerers, etc., is rapidly becoming

⁶ *Educational Review, English Journal, Journal of Educational Psychology, School and Society, Pedagogical Seminar, Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking.*

⁷ Director of Speech Improvement in the Public Schools of New York, and Director of the Speech Clinic in the College of the City of New York.

greater, then, and then only, will provision for the eradication of such defects be easier to obtain. The whole problem of voice defects in relation to economic efficiency is too great to discuss here, except in the case of the teaching profession, which will be discussed later.

Many suggestions have been made as to the method of solving the problem of speech correction. Prof. Albert Shower, of Kansas State Agricultural College, suggests that work in the form of illustrated lectures and practice lessons should be given in the grades to both teachers and pupils. This proposal has the objection of being too superficial—teachers must know more about defects than the children in order to be of any help to the latter.

This suggestion, made by an English teacher, is quite interesting: "Let the teacher counsel the pupil . . . as to the fact that his voice is harsh, or low, or thin, or whatever it may be. Let the teachers, as a body or through selected individuals, listen for the misuse of the speaking voice in the halls and on the playground. This, then, is the specific suggestion concerning voice-training which I would make."⁸ This, of course, is better than nothing, but how is the child to benefit unless these same teachers are able to help him to *correct* his voice, in addition to pointing out what is wrong?

The most general suggestion and the one most generally in practice is to have a special voice teacher. This is a splendid idea, especially for those schools with plenty of money; but what about the thousands of smaller schools all over the country that cannot afford to have a special teacher? This suggestion, then, is hardly practicable enough.

All of these articles on the subject of voice improvement realize the fact that the school is the place to check speech defects. With this to start on, it should be comparatively easy to reach some conclusion. If the school is the place to begin, then logically, the teacher is the person to do the work, and the whole solution of the problem lies in the training of the teacher. If this is true, then obviously, the normal school is the institution to lead the reform. With the increasingly high standard of education required for the teaching profession, it will not be long

⁸Davis, "Vocal Training in the Secondary Schools," *English Journal*, April, 1916, p. 244.

before all of our teachers are graduates of either normal schools, universities, or special schools. Of these, the normal schools send out by far the greater share of those teachers who have charge of the children during the period when it is most important to check defects in speech. This fact is clear then: the normal schools send out the teachers who have the greatest need of a scientific knowledge of voice training.

If every normal school student should be required to have a thorough scientific course in voice training before graduation, the problem of voice training could be solved.

This would involve an expense to the state of one special teacher for every such school in the state, a very negligible expense compared to that of supplying one teacher for every public school in the state except to such states as Wisconsin, which is more plentiful with her normals than most other states.

Such a course would have to do two things: first, correct defects of the students' voices; second, give them practice in the diagnosis and correction of speech defects in children.

First of all, such a course should correct defects of the students themselves. A visit to almost any average-sized class in almost any normal school will reveal the fact that there are lisps, stutters, and shrill, harsh, or guttural voices in every class. A question or two will inevitably show that these people are planning to teach the following fall, or the next one at the very latest. Can you imagine a teacher of the eighth grade who lisps badly? A young man recently reported, after he had visited three grades in a near-by town, that he was astonished to find that one teacher lisped, the other two had "peacock voices," and not more than ten per cent of the eighty pupils had a pleasant voice. Surely such a situation should be remedied.

A normal school should be ashamed to send out teachers who lisp or stammer or have wretched voices of any kind. Not only that, but it is unfair to the student who is to be sent out.

A city superintendent was interviewing a student relative to a position only a few weeks ago. After a very short conversation, he asked, "Is that your natural voice?" "Why, yes," replied the student, very much taken aback at such a question. The interview was closed and the girl lost her chance of a good posi-

tion, because no teacher had ever told her she had a bad voice, and she was not required by the school to improve it before she graduated.

In order to pass the United States Civil Service examination for teachers, the applicant must pass a test in oral reading, and if the rigorous examination of nose and throat which follows shows any bad faults, the candidate is very likely to be dropped.

Many of the blanks sent out by county superintendents to applicants for schools have several questions about the voice, tonsils, adenoids, breathing, etc., which, if answered truthfully, would keep many a teacher from a good position.

Very often an examination of the nose and throat of a student will reveal conditions that cause many other troubles beside a bad voice. For instance, the report on one girl sent to a specialist for nose and throat examination showed the following condition:

Throat history: has had attacks of sore throat.

Aural history: Periodic attacks of deafness which usually follow a cold.

Naso-pharynx: adenoid tissue.

Eustachian tubes: surrounded by adenoid tissue.

Tonsils: fossa filled with tissue even to the pillars.

Posterior Pillar: not adherent to tonsils.

Anterior Pillar: not adherent to tonsils.

Post-nasal space: filled with mucous.

Thyroid: normal.

Is it any wonder that this girl had a bad voice, poor scholarship, and poor health?

The diagnosis of another girl showed:

Septum: deviated to the left, leaving left nasal passage obstructed and narrow.

High dental arch. Upper front incisor teeth protrude. Short upper lip.

Mouth breather.

Small goiter present.

This report and numerous others, very similar, establish a close relation between a poor voice, poor health, and weak scholarship. The September number of the *Medical Record* publishes an article

by Dr. Ira S. Wile, a member of the New York City board of education, on "The Economic Value of Speech Correction," in which he says, "It is patent that the average sufferer from a speech defect is deprived of his fullest opportunities of education and self-expression. The majority of speech defects are combined with defects of vision, hearing, and muscular coördination, or cerebral development."

If such defects could be corrected at the very beginning of school life, the effect on voice, mentality, and health would be vastly greater than the effects of such correction at the age of twenty or twenty-five. Dr. Smiley Blanton says, "Teachers trained for this work can accomplish a great deal of good in our schools and can save many children from life-long suffering and failure."⁹

Therefore, it is of great importance that the teachers in the grades—the lower grades particularly—should be able to diagnose speech defects and correct them, or have them corrected by a physician.

This, then, is the second aim of such a course as the one advocated—to train students in the detection and correction of speech defects. With a training school in connection with every normal school and the public schools willing and anxious to cooperate, as they usually are, there is a splendid chance for observation and plenty of opportunity for individual work with children. Such common troubles as lisping, stammering, harshness, nasality, indistinct speech, high pitch, and monotony can be found in almost every grade; chiefly, however, in the lower grades. This is another reason why the normal school is the logical place to do this work—theory can be put at once into practice, under the careful supervision of the voice teacher.

The voice work in the normal school should be correlated with the work of the physical education department. The voice teacher should have on file a record of the physical examination of the student, his class record, and the record of the nose and throat examination made by a specialist, if the teacher has not a medical degree, together with a history of the person as nearly as it can be ascertained. Very often a bad voice is directly due to

⁹ Dr. Blanton, "The University of Wisconsin Speech Clinic," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, May, 1916, p. 260.

the environment of the individual. A man with a tense, harsh voice said that he realized that his voice was becoming worse, but he had no idea what the trouble was. A very informal conversation with him brought out the fact that for the last few years he had been living in the same house with a man he hated. They never quarrelled, but their relations were always strained, and the young man fell into the habit of gritting his teeth to keep from saying unpleasant things. This practice made his jaw tense and and his voice began to lose its freedom and flexibility. This man has now moved from that house; he is cheerful and happy again, and before long, his voice is bound to show the change.

A girl who has a very harsh, flat voice said she knew it was due to a teacher she had in the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. This teacher had very poor discipline, and the room was always in a turmoil. She was partially deaf, so that the children, when they recited, had to almost shout to make her hear above the noise in the room. This strain for three years was more than her voice could stand, and she is now paying the penalty.

Such situations show that beside the anatomy and physiology of speech mechanism, the teacher must also have a knowledge of psychology.

Such teachers, at the head of voice clinics in every normal school in the country, could do a great deal toward solving the present voice problem; for the next generation of teachers would be equipped to handle the next generation of school children, and before many generations have passed, the American voice would not be characterized by its badness.

THE AUDIENCE AS THE JURY

RAYMOND B. PEASE

University of Wyoming

NUMEROUS writers on debating have proposed ways and means for reforming the usual system of judging intercollegiate debate, but it seems to the writer there is still field for further consideration. One of the latest suggestions was that there be no decision at all; and inquiry shows that several debates of the season just closed have been thus conducted. Another suggestion was that one expert and impartial judge make the decision by his single vote. Considerable discussion has centered too in the question of whether intercollegiate debating was to be considered a "game." Now it seems to the present writer that completely eliminating a decision takes away altogether too much interest which will naturally attach to the "game" idea, and that the element of rivalry is too strong and vital in real public speaking to warrant such elimination. The second suggestion, that of having a single expert judge, does not, however helpful in other respects, eliminate the partisanship which would seem far more fitting to athletic than to intellectual contests. Furthermore, it does not secure what all public speaking should secure, the largest possible contact with the public. Right here is where the present article desires to suggest further possibilities. The contention of the article is that college audiences should function as nearly as possible as audiences in the world at large; that there should be the largest possible influence of and appeal to the audience; that we cannot otherwise expect the greatest good either to the audience or to the speakers; that to secure these ends the audience must have a part in the "game."

The inception of this idea came just after the Denver-Wyoming debate last winter. Professor Kingsley of Denver had suggested our use of the no decision method in connection with a suggestion first made, I believe, by Mr. Westfall, of Colorado Agricultural College: that only outside teams debate at any institution. The idea of the last suggestion was to have neutral ground and thus put both teams upon an even basis. In a triangular league, for instance, the teams for institutions *A*, *B*, *C*,

would all debate away from home: the affirmative from *A* with the negative team of *B*, at institution *C*; affirmative *B* with negative *C* at *A*; and affirmative *C* with negative *A* at *B*. The thought instantly occurred to me, "Why, if we have a neutral audience, shall we not make the audience the jury?" The idea grew into more definite form as we talked it over that evening and the next day, with the result that the University of Wyoming later on proposed such a system for use in the triangular league next year. Of four different coaches to whom it has been proposed, two expressed themselves very favorably and the other two feared there would be a lessening of local interest because of no local team on hand to be supported. The inference must be that some coaches still feel there must be the spirit of partisanship in order to get out a crowd. Inasmuch as the system has never been tried out, this may be the case. But there are two things to be said about it: first as already intimated, such a spirit does not make for good judgment; and secondly, it is very possible that, if the audience is given a natural and interesting part, a much greater interest may be developed than the present system may afford even at its best.

In further explanation of the plan, it should be noticed that there will be not merely the neutral audience but the neutral coach or coaches of debating, thus furnishing at once and without any cost, the desirable element of expert judgment. Further than that, there will be neutral public speaking classes, which may be better posted (I hesitate to say *will* be) than the general audience. Thinking over the situation—entirely changed it must be observed by allowing no home team—it appeared well to retain the old three-vote system but to arrange it rather on a basis of a vote from each group. Of course the decision might be rendered on the basis of a majority vote by the audience as a single group; but the objection to this is in the lack of distinction of significance of the votes. On the three-group basis the audience might vote upon the right and wrong of the question; the public speaking class or classes upon the logic of argument as presented; and the coaches upon the effectiveness of delivery.

For the first group we shall probably have to wrench our traditions considerably to see the value of their voting upon the

question rather than upon the debate. The vote of a jury or of an executive committee or of a city council to whom a student might speak, when college days are over, would not depend directly on what they thought of his ability as a speaker. On the other hand their vote must go to whichever side they think is right. To be sure relative ability will count; but it will be sufficient if included in the one vote as to what they think of the *question* at the end of the discussion. If any individual has his opinion changed by the debate, it is the triumph for the side to which he is drawn. This is entirely natural in real life. Just as natural, too, is the retention of old opinion in spite of possibly better arguments against it. Under the old three-man system we must, of course, rule out everything but a consideration of how the argument is handled by the respective sides. It will be seen, however, that under the present suggestion there is naturalness and justice in allowing for a vote on the merits of the *question*. It is the vote upon the merits of the question that counts in the "game" of real life. One trouble with the prevailing system is that this very necessary element is given no place in the college "game." It seems to me that there is no objection to the conception of public speaking as a "game," if only we make it natural enough.

The second group, the public speaking classes, should be interested in the balancing of the issues. The attendance of this group may be made part of the class work in public speaking and under this condition I think there will be no question whatever about their interest. I have found that some of the most interesting recitations were those based on debates just given or soon to come. Previous discussions and analysis of the issues involved would make them keen on the subject of logical argument and would give a very practical basis of application. Again as in the case of the audience (that is, the rest of the audience) an important group is given a definite part to play. It seems to me that there is an immense loss to our public speaking classes if they cannot thus apply the principles of the class outside of the classroom. Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon this as a larger, naturalistic basis for the public speaking classes. The majority vote of this group would, of course, constitute the second of the three votes which are to decide the debate.

The third group should probably constitute three or five of the local faculty. All of these need not be of the public speaking department inasmuch as those of other departments have frequently given careful attention to the theory of public speaking. On every faculty, indeed, there are many who have had college courses in this work. Moreover, every faculty has members from other departments that can give much aid in criticism of the local teams; and this plan of having them take part in the decision between visiting teams works very nicely in connection. In other words, there should be encouragement to broadening the contact of the debaters with their own faculty, and to broadening the contact of their faculty with debating activities. Composite coaching should have a much higher place than is usual at present; and composite judgments on intercollegiate debates will tend, I think, to promote faculty interest.

It will have been observed by now how narrow is the public contact under the old system of judging, compared to what is possible even in college debating. The only group that the above suggestion would seem to omit is that of the general public outside of college; but this too can be included in the general audience and sometimes even in the committee of experts. It seems to me worthy our most serious consideration, whether we are justified in omitting any of the natural elements. I have high respect for the single-judge decision when that comes from an expert; and especially if it makes analysis of the different phases in which sometimes one team and sometimes the other may be superior. But it has not, I repeat, anything more than the single-judgment basis, and I believe we can get at once a consideration of these different phases and a consideration from many minds.

It may, of course, be argued that this system would be a little complex, and yet probably not as complex as where the single judge would be given an hour to compile his review and summary. This, I think, was the plan recently suggested in this journal. Again it would seem no more complex than the decision of the judge who has to figure over his complicated table including what he feels to be all the necessary phases of a debate. Who has not known the suspense and sometimes the weariness of waiting for an undecided judge or an overtechnical judge to

make up his decision? One or two have suggested to me that it might be a little cumbersome in getting the vote of each of the three groups. I see no reason why with teams of three men each the teams themselves might not be divided into three committees each including one of each team, each committee to receive the vote of each group. But whatever be the method of receiving the vote, we must remember that there is but to determine the majority of each of three groups and furthermore, that the average college audience under the present system is lamentably small.

We may very well give over "rooting" to football, for rooting is notoriously non-intellectual. On the other hand, we may well strive to secure greater mental activity from our debate audiences. If those audiences *must* be small, why small let them be. Not that we love college spirit less, but intellectual activity more. Who has not heard some "collegian" say, "Well we won, didn't we? That's fine! Great work!" Such a congratulation *à la football*, makes the assumption that both know the verdict to have been just right. But in how many cases do these collegians have any adequate basis of *personal* judgment? I think the point of this is obvious. The partisan audience is altogether too much delighted over a victory or too much cast down by a defeat. The matter of winning weighs all too heavily to allow consideration of the argument. The matter of winning is played up for the local audience and it is the one and only thing considered; a successful season, another scalp, etc. Under the ordinary system, they are not required and they are not even encouraged to consider the argument proper. It seems to me, therefore, that the objections against not having a home team, make the greatest possible reasons why we *should have* only neutral teams. I have discussed this question for nearly half a year with a good many people and I am more and more inclined to the view that the interest and determination of the several faculties can make it a distinct success. Certainly it offers interesting possibilities of a more scientific, or at least a more natural, basis of judgment. The very suggestion of complexity, if that be raised, is itself one of the most natural comparisons to life.

It may be of interest to quote several of the written opinions that have come to me.

"The training such a plan would afford to students of public speaking would no doubt be a valuable factor."

"I should like to have the vote of the whole audience decide the debate. The effect produced by the speakers upon the audience could best be ascertained in this way."

"I have for several years been interested in such a plan because it seems to me to get back to fundamental motives. In actually working it out, there will be many details that may not easily be controlled, for example, the greater interests of the students in one school than in the other. Nevertheless, it is an experiment that will be tried." (Note that the general student vote would count but one in three even if there were greater interests in one of the schools represented.)

"In my opinion, this proposed plan is a great improvement. I should like to suggest that the three coaches in the league outline the more important rules that ought to govern the technic of debating. These rules should be furnished at least to the group of 'specialists,' which group, I think, should not be less than three."

Finally, the essential claim for the plan, it must now be seen, is that it gets back to "fundamental motives." In all the discussion upon it that claim has never been attacked. Unless it is not true that it offers greater possibilities in natural and effective debating, it would seem worthy of serious consideration by other institutions; for if everyone has his natural part, the "game" element becomes not a "counterfeit presentment," but the real thing."

PSYCHOLOGICAL PARALLELISMS BETWEEN SPEECH DISORDER AND ORAL ENGLISH¹

WALTER B. SWIFT, M.D.
Harvard Graduate School of Medicine

BY PSYCHOLOGICAL parallelisms between speech disorder and oral English, I mean vague correlations between conditions that exist in one and those which are found in analogous form, in the other.

In this paper I wish to compare psychological content, the vague mental background of speech, in a word, the mentation above our external, oral utterances, with that utterance itself.

In order to discover a few characteristics of speech disorder that have their counterparts or analogous characteristics in oral English, let us consider for a few moments some cases of speech disorder and analyze their mental background enough to catch the size of its content, and then let us compare this result with some of the psychological contents found in cases where speech is supposed to be above the pathological, where it is supposed to rank as normal, and yet, where there are at the same time numerous individual varieties. In a word, let us compare the psychological content of a speech disorder with the psychological content of normal speech and see if there are any parallelisms.

We all know that, outside of the field of speech, individuality (and its varieties) externalizes itself in various forms. Take, for example, the field of disease. The whole clinical picture of any given disease is necessarily modified by the dominating individuality of a person behind that disease. In other walks of life it is recognized that the individual type plays a leading rôle everywhere. In most undertakings, in fact, one is inclined to look for the individual to fit the place rather than to select some vague, generalized personality and mould it into the place. In dramatic performances we choose the already formed individual fitted to take a certain part rather than picking out

¹Read in the Harvard Union, Cambridge, Mass., April 7, 1916, at the Third Annual Meeting of the New England Oral English and Public Speaking Conference.

individuals indiscriminately and moulding them into the individuality of the part. As we look now into some of the rarer forms of speech defect, I think we shall find persisting this same principle of dominating individuality.

The external speech of the idiot may consist in a grunt or in a few words which he has taken years to learn, or there may be the utterance of a few short and simple sentences. The psychological background or mental content above this sort of utterance is found to be marked by emptiness, lack of mentation, undevelopment, incomplete sensory intake, slight—if any—proper interpretation, often no mental digestive processes, and little, if any, motor control exerted over the output. The mental act behind idiotic utterance consists in a quick speech reflex along a well-trodden line, with as little mentation as one can imagine. Pathologic study shows deficiency in the structure of the brain and that therefore the nerve foundation requisite to utterance is lacking.

The speech of the imbecile is a little better. It is usually long delayed in starting, and at the time of completion may consist, at best, of pretty perfect utterance of short sounds, both vowels and consonants, coupled usually with the ability to utter a few of almost any monosyllabic words. But the great lack in the utterance of the imbecile consists in an inability to combine words. For example, you ask him to say word by word "the cat ran down the cellar stairs" and he can say it, but ask him to say that whole phrase and he misses it. The mentation of the imbecile consists in a small amount of sensory intake, some vague stabs at interpretation of that intake which are often sufficient to guide him in some of his ordinary doings. Over this there is a very slight amount of collaboration and some little control of the motor output. The mental act in cases of imbecility consists in a fairly characteristic reflex speech that shows a little mentation but fails, and constantly fails, in combinations of ideas and phrase expression. The brain here has more structure than idiocy, and yet it provides only a faulty foundation for the fulfilment of its expected function.

Another feature common to both of these speech disorders is this: There is a slight possibility of development in each case,

but the general picture—the whole external appearance in each condition—the show, remains practically static and unchanged. There is a fairly stable psychological content and a pretty uniform vocal externalization of that content. We also notice a fact which is so closely correlated here as to deserve mention, the fact that the brain structure, on large lines, shows corresponding variations.

We turn now to the moron. The moron is a high-grade mental defective. He is so high, sometimes, that he fails of detection; he is often difficult to diagnose without long experience in making mental measurements, and he often passes muster where he should not have passed. The speech disorder in the moron consists in the lack of a high degree of power to combine utterances. Individual sounds are correct, any and all words may be uttered, and usually he can frame short or even pretty long sentences, but when the moron is put up against complicated combinations, subtle connotations, the need to make intricate mental analyses or to follow intricate ramifications of thought, there is utter failure. The mind appears like a child's mind, as if the individual had stopped mental growth at fifteen, while the body had gone on developing for years. The psychological content of various individual morons shows a pretty complete and elaborate sense intake, fairly full interpretation of such sensorial data, simple forms of mental collaboration, and fairly full control of motor output. The lack, in a word, consists in the absence of complicated collaboration processes.

One moron may show his deficiency in relation to playmates and play with those that are younger; another may show it in another expression of mental processes such as study. The brain in the moron exhibits an inherited variation in structure.

Thus we have shown in a general way that oral utterance is parallel to psychological content and that it is parallel to brain condition.

A review of these conditions shows certain elements or phases of the situation that are constant and are never reversed. For example, in the idiot we never find the power of collaboration or the utterance of complicated sentences that we have in the normal individual or even that which we have in the moron. In

the imbecile we have a half-way house to normal psychological content and vocal externalizations. This form is always higher than the idiot and never as high as the typical moron. In the moron itself, we always find the basis of sensorial content, interpretative ability, with slight collaborative processes, but we never find those marked deficiencies of the idiot or the imbecile.

We have here types of speech disorder as externalization of types of psychological content with a structural foundation in brain abnormality, and these are pretty constant variables. When the speech output enlarges the psychological content enlarges, and the brain structure becomes more normal.

One might reverse this order and say that the individuality of the brain type allows more amplified development of the psychological content, and that this, in turn, naturally permits a more complete vocal output. Within the class these types are constant. They never change, one to the other. They never revolve very much. They are susceptible of some slight improvement, but the type is constant.

If you have caught my meaning, we have here, then, a clear picture which I want to use in asking a question and in stimulating discussion.

Have we enough evidence to take this point over into what we call the normal sphere of speech and make the same correlation? Are we justified in saying that normal brains necessitate normal psychological content and normal oral content? Can we say, as we hear men talk, that their oral variety depends on a psychological variety, and this on a cortical brain variety? A side question might also be asked: If the brain variety comes from heredity—and we can be sure that brain heredity enters here—are we then to breed for voices, minds, and brains and thus indirectly, are we to assume a sort of fatalism here, a sort of fixed, stable, inflexible nature, educable in part, but which when training is forced, presents a stony resistance beyond which we fail to educate? Again, are we orally what we are because we are psychologically what we are, and this because we are anatomically what we are, and does each type, therefore, stand a unit, unique, unchangeable, yet slightly elastic?

Picking the individual for the dramatic part was mentioned above as a necessity. The study of speech disorder and the psychological background in mental defectives shows us that there is a pretty constant type that is limited to classes, immovable and slightly educable. Can we say this same thing about all normal mentalities as we meet them in the world? Can we say that each man represents a type of speech, psychic content, and brain basis, and must we assume that he is in his intellectual background pretty much the same inflexible thing, perhaps slightly variable, a little elastic, somewhat amenable to education, evolution, and change, but after all a set, invariable, fatalistic entity belonging to a stable type? This query I open for your decision in the discussion.

Summary: A study of speech defect in the varying degrees of psychological content, with corresponding change of brain background shows that the psychological content corresponds to the amount of oral output.

A study of a variety of types of speech defect shows that the output varies somewhat according to the type within the class.

Brain structure, psychological content, and oral output thus run pretty constantly parallel between different classes of mental defectives. This shows that in the background we have a pretty firm establishment of a mental type with which we must deal.

To enliven the discussion, I will carry my conclusion to its end, and say that in what we term the normal individual structure, psychological content and oral output therefore run vaguely parallel in normal types and are only partially educable, changeable, variable, but are mostly fixed, fatalistic, and firm.

SPOKEN ENGLISH 1-1 AT SMITH COLLEGE

CLARA B. WILLIAMS

Smith College

I HAVE read with great interest the description of the fundamental courses at the three universities which appeared in the April number and I was gratified to see how much we have in common and how nearly consonant some of our ideas are.

I believe, though the methods of approach may vary, the fundamentals of the subject are the same, and whether applied to a class of men or of women only the usual adjustment to the needs of the special class should be made.

I have taught men, and, although my experience has been confined to professional men, lawyers and preachers, I am sure if I were teaching undergraduate men I would teach them as I do our girls. If I were teaching in a coeducational institution I believe nothing would induce me to put the men and women into separate classes—not even the men themselves.

At Smith College, Spoken English is not required, it is entirely elective through the four years, and the same credit is given it that is accorded to any other college subject.

All students on entering college confer with members of the Spoken English department and if they are found to have especially bad voices or extreme speech defects or peculiarities they are strongly advised, though not forced, to take the fundamental course. Usually we have about five hundred students entering. Of these probably one-third are advised to take the course and generally about half of those advised do so. A list of these students is kept and they are given special attention by instructors outside of regular class work for the correction of their specific troubles. By far the larger number taking the course do it freely and of their own election.

Many students taking course 1-1 have a well-defined purpose: some of them intend to teach; some want to act, or think they do; some are interested in a line of work that will necessitate their speaking in public; some are interested in the interpretation of literature; some desire it for general culture; and some have obvious "hidden" motives.

Although we have courses in the three upper years in all phases of the subject, public speaking and debate, interpretation and acting, phonetics, etc., course 1-1 is fundamental to and prerequisite to them all.

Whatever the form of the thought, if it is to be given vocal expression, it must be revealed through the voice and body, therefore, the preparation for the expression of all forms of thought is essentially the same.

Whatever one's ultimate purpose may be—whether teaching, acting, becoming a public speaker, or merely to make oneself as efficient as possible for meeting the ordinary demands of life—the preparation is essentially the same.

I think it is generally agreed that before specialization there should be a good general foundation.

Spoken English 1-1 is described in the catalogue, "Fundamental Course in Vocal Expression, open to Freshmen and Sophomores; two hours through the year."

In this college our courses are graded 1, 2, 3, and 4—the first grade being for freshmen and sophomores, the second for sophomores and juniors, the third for juniors and seniors, and the fourth for seniors and graduate students. The first numeral, therefore, indicates the grade, the second, the number of the course.

We have a grade three fundamental course for juniors and seniors, three hours through the year, so we do not now have the problem of trying to adapt one course to all classes of students.

From what has been stated above it will be seen that the objects of the fundamental course must be general: to remove fear and self-consciousness; correct faults of voice, speech, and hearing; enable them to speak and think at the same time; in brief, to prepare them for the greatest possible personal development by removing interferences and stimulating normal processes.

The method of approach depends on the instructor and the special needs of the students.

We have usually five or six instructors giving this course and I am sure no two of them would proceed in the same way. This is not only unnecessary and undesirable but impossible.

There is, however, always a uniformity of purpose and an agreement on certain fundamental principles so that the results achieved are more or less the same and students are ready to go on into other courses with equal preparation.

The first step is to remove fear and self-consciousness and learn something of the students' personal needs.

The tact and penetration of the instructor will have to guide her in this.

Usually I think there is little trouble in creating a friendly atmosphere, making them all feel free to talk informally. We attempt to keep the sections rather small, not more than fifteen in a division, which helps in establishing an informal relation between the students.

Sometimes, with an excessively timid student, it will be necessary to adopt various expedients to lead her out and make her venture to express herself, but after she has accomplished the difficult feat once, she is usually exhilarated by it and subsequent efforts are increasingly successful.

I have seen students who had never had the courage to express themselves and had consequently been overlooked and taken for granted till self-depreciation had almost extinguished them, suddenly realize that they were persons like other people and could talk and be listened to. Their joy in realizing this was at once so satisfying and so pathetic that it did more to make me realize the great spiritual opportunities for the teacher of expression than any other thing.

While the students are thus being induced to talk informally or tell stories or read, the instructor is studying them trying to discover their faults and weaknesses and searching for the cause.

These faults and weaknesses may be physical or psychological, that is they may be due to some actual physical obstruction or weakness or they may be due entirely to some mental cause.

It is difficult to tell because these classes overlap, often what appears to be a psychological weakness entirely disappearing when some physical cause is removed, or what seems to be a purely physical trouble vanishes when a mental stimulus is applied.

It is for this reason that the questions of correcting faulty voices and developing weak ones are too complicated for the unskilled person to answer.

Only the inexperienced claim to be able to diagnose these troubles quickly and accurately and I have observed that inexperienced and untrained teachers give more exercises, generally, than teachers of longer experience and broader training.

I have known people to take certain classified exercises which they have found described in some book and give them to large groups of students, regardless of the individual differences and needs of the students and apparently totally oblivious to the fact that though two students may seem to have exactly the same fault, the causes may be wholly different, and what may not hurt one may distinctly do damage to the other. Just because these exercises are labelled "For the Cure of This" or "For the Development of That," some people grasp at them exactly as though they were patent medicines put upon the market, with the same kind of guarantee. Students are told to practice these exercises, but happily, the wholesome dislike on the part of most students for the routine and mechanical often saves them from the real harm that might come to them if they were more virtuous and diligent in the performance of the tasks assigned them.

The wise teacher will generally not tell students immediately of their faults but will encourage them and stimulate and develop the positive side, leading them into a consciousness of their weaknesses and awakening a desire for development.

Until a student is conscious of her needs and is ready and eager to coöperate with the instructor by intelligently and faithfully practicing exercises, I think exercises are worse than futile.

Therefore, except in special cases, we do not immediately begin giving students exercises.

It may be some weeks or it may be a whole semester before any real exercises are given. Before this, the instructor has probably talked with them about breathing and has begun the work of establishing normal conditions for voice.

During these first weeks the students are reading, talking, telling stories.

It is usually suggested that they choose simpler forms of literature, lyric and narrative poetry, short stories, etc. The instructor must lead them to see the possibilities of "Self-Expression" as a subject for college study.

There are no collections of "Choice Readings" or "Prize Pieces" on our shelves and though at first some of them deplore the absence of these they soon get used to foraging for their own food.

By their choice of literature they reveal their tastes and their literary background.

The instructor points out the advantages of good literature for vocal expression.

They take a new interest in literature, they acquire a certain pride in making the acquaintance of new authors.

They learn to listen to each other and to observe certain differences.

They become interested in the question of why one student holds attention and another fails to.

They begin to follow the processes of the mind as revealed through the voice—they see the relation between thinking and speaking.

It becomes evident to them, that the more clearly a student thinks the more clearly she speaks, often the stimulation of her mental activity causing such a corresponding response in the speech organs that bad speech habits are corrected. On the other hand they see that a student whose thinking is strong and whose earnestness is compelling may be greatly handicapped by a speech defect or a fault of voice which could not be eradicated without special treatment.

They are led to see that undeniable changes take place in the voice when the imagination is awakened—and they become convinced of the value of reading poetry as a means of developing the voice.

They come to realize that a small weak voice is inadequate for the expression of a big thought or a deep emotion that the "modest violet" must relinquish her prejudices for the "sweetly feminine" voice or else limit her expression to infinitesimal thoughts.

They learn to despise affectation and honor sincerity.

They soon turn the searchlight of inquiry upon themselves; they listen to themselves and they begin to realize their own inadequacy and to become conscious of their own needs.

They are now ready to take an intelligent interest in the technical side and are able to get some advantage from exercises.

Preceding all exercises, I think right conditions of breathing and the relaxation of the muscles of the throat should be established.

This is what Dr. Curry calls the "coördination of the throat and the diaphragm."

Is is remarkable that although this seems so simple, it is often very hard to do. Until a student who has constricted throat muscles and a stiff tongue and lower jaw once gets the sense of the relaxation of these, simultaneously with the taking of the breath preparatory to speaking or producing tone, I think she will be very liable to increase the constriction. Dr. Curry's "nature" methods of inducing this condition by yawning, exclamations of surprise, etc., are excellent.

When this fundamental condition has been established the instructor will proceed to give whatever exercises she thinks best. I cannot go into the detailed account of exercises in such a paper as this; only those that would be helpful to all would be given in class; exercises for training the ear, developing strength, range, and flexibility, etc.

Those students who have specific defects are given individual attention or treated in small groups and they are given appointments for supervised practice; these students have been mentioned above, as specially advised to take the course. This special work is done in addition to the regular class work. Dr. Curry's *Foundations of Expression* is used in this course—probably not more than eight or ten chapters would be discussed in the class—this also would be at the discretion of the instructor, but the general plan and principles of this book are used as a basis for the course.

It is unnecessary for me to say that I am heartily in sympathy with the ideals expressed by Miss Bertha Forbes Herring in the April number; and if all students came to us with the kind of preparation she advocates, Spoken English 1-2 would become Spoken English 1-1 at Smith College.

FACULTY JUDGING

R. O. T. HOLLISTER

University of Michigan

TO WHAT extent should teachers of public speaking judge their local contests in oratory and debate? This is the question I wish to discuss under the heading "faculty judging."

The question of judging contests is one of importance to every teacher of public speaking, for it influences his faith in contests, his spirit in classroom work, and the tone of public speaking in the school. Teachers and students cannot be long dissatisfied with the judging in contests without losing their heart in such contests and hence much of their interest in the more fundamental aims of departments of public speaking. In extreme cases they may feel that contests are not worth while, in others, that judges should be eliminated, but the majority have sought for better judgment. This search has led some to believe that public speaking contests should be judged by public speaking teachers. As a result many debates are now judged by teachers of public speaking or by men trained in intercollegiate contests, and in the last meeting of the Northern Oratorical League the faculty representatives from the seven colleges judged the contest, each man voting on all speakers except his own.

It is not, however, "faculty judging" in intercollegiate contests that I wish to discuss, but in local contests. I believe that as a general principle, all home contests leading to interscholastic contests should be judged by the members of the department of Public Speaking, or where such a department is not large enough, by judges selected by and acting with the members of this department. This is what I have in mind when I use the term "faculty judging." I do not mean that the teacher or teachers of public speaking should pick students to represent their school *without a formal contest*. Formal contests should by all means be held, but the teachers of public speaking should be entirely responsible for the judgment rendered.

The value of contests is recognized. While some may complain that the same spontaneity and force that is found in ex-

perienced speakers is not always present in academic contests, and may regret that contests are contests and not "actual" occasions, yet the fact remains that these contests stimulate students to develop their speech possibilities, and do much to strengthen the interest of the student body in the work of public speaking.

The fundamental purpose of these contests is to develop speech power, and not to maintain an intercollegiate sport. In athletic contests the main purpose is to provide recreation and advertising, but in oratorical contests and debates the main purpose is to educate. The contest is a means of drawing out the public speaking possibilities of students. In fact many of the most important educative values of courses in public speaking are involved in speaking contests.

If this be so, then it is evident that such contests belong to the department of Public Speaking rather than to that of Rhetoric, Economics, or History; that the responsibility for the success of these contests, for their proper conduct and the careful training of participants, should rest upon the teachers of public speaking, and should be regarded by them as part of their opportunity to encourage and develop better public speaking. Speaking contests should not belong primarily to the school as a whole, or to any organization of students in debating societies or oratorical associations, but to that department of academic work whose special purpose is to educate students in the various branches of public speaking. Where such a department does not exist, then the debating societies, or the teacher of English or History or Mathematics, or any individual or organization that realizes the value of public speaking contests may well take them in hand, and pray for the time when a department of public speaking with a teacher hired primarily for the work may be established.

The relation between departments of Public Speaking and speaking contests has always been close. In some cases departments have sprung from the demands created by contests, in many cases contests have been fostered by teachers of public speaking, but the ultimate goal of contests and teachers is the same—the development of better speech habits and greater speech power. Contests, then, logically belong to departments of Public Speaking as phases of education in the speech arts.

But should the responsibility for judging these contests rest entirely with the department of Public Speaking? Should the teachers exercise a controlling influence in the judgment rendered?

In considering this question certain facts should be understood. First, judging in a contest is a form of grading, an attempt to classify contestants according to their excellence. Any process of grading may be either easy or difficult. If a single factor is involved and a mechanical standard of measurement exists the grading is relatively easy. For example, peaches of a single variety are commonly graded for market according to size. There are big peaches, middle-sized peaches, and little peaches, and a simple machine that will measure size will grade peaches. But, when several factors are involved and the standard of grading is a personal one, judging becomes more complicated and difficult.

Again, it is easy to detect wide differences—the very large and the very small, the exceptionally good and the very poor; but narrow differences, even when a single factor is involved, are difficult to determine with certainty. For example, most students can tell whether one note is higher or lower than another when the interval is an octave, but many cannot tell when the interval is only a semitone. Wherever narrow differences and many factors are involved, and where the standard of measurement is subject to personal taste, judging becomes difficult and variable.

It is perfectly evident that in contests in oratory and debating many factors present themselves for measurement and grading. These are not of the same importance to all judges, and are not determined by a fixed mechanical standard. When we stop to think of just a few of the more general factors involved in public speaking, we realize how complex the process of grading is. There is stage presence—position of feet, poise of body, tilt of head, even dress; there are movements of the body—feet, arms, head, face, eyes; there is the voice with its pronunciation, distinctness, quality, modulation, rate, rhythm, etc.; there are the general psychological aspects of the speaker's relation to his audience—self-mastery, directness, sympathy, intimacy, etc.; there is the thought—its substance, logical arrangement, imagi-

native vitality, and the diction and style of its expression. Any one of these factors may appear of great or little importance, and all are subject to personal standards of measurement.

With these complex elements entering into the conclusions of judges, it is evident that uniformity of opinion cannot be expected, and that criticisms of judgment are inevitable. These criticisms come from two main sources: first, from the losers of the contest and their friends, and second, from disinterested differences of opinion. Both of these sources of criticism will continue to exist under any system of judging.

Another fact concerning judging is this: a trained judge is regarded in all walks of life as better than an untrained one. A trained judge is apt to recognize and weigh carefully a larger number of factors than an untrained one. In selecting a white wyandotte rooster for breeding an untrained judge will commonly choose the largest bird. He judges chickens by the market value, and bigness is all he can see. But the trained judge considers many points. So in judging an oratorical contest the untrained judge often selects the speaker with the loudest voice, or the longest gestures, or the most ornate style, or with a hobby like his own. The trained judge is much less apt to base his decision on a single factor.

There are some who will admit that a trained judge is best for most things, but not for speaking contests. They hold that speakers in "actual" life must be judged by their audiences and hence in contests should be judged by men and women who have not studied the art of speaking except as accidental auditors. They hold that the market value of the chicken is the best standard for improving the breed; that students will not have trained teachers of speech arts to judge them out of school, and hence should not have them in. The fallacies involved in this conclusion I shall leave for the reader to state for himself. But it seems reasonable to believe that if the function of contests and of departments of Public Speaking is to develop better standards of public speaking, the ones who should be directly responsible for the standards encouraged by the judgment in public speaking contests should be the teachers of public speaking. The only possible answer to this is that the standards of teachers of public speaking

are more artificial and less desirable than the standards of all sorts of men who are merely individuals out of which audiences are made. This charge of artificiality impeaches the teachers and departments of Public Speaking, and must be denied as a delusion.

But are teachers of public speaking the best trained judges? Are they not over trained? Do they not know too much? When a student loses a contest he sometimes thinks so, but common sense tells us that this objection to "faculty judging" has little real value. Common sense tells us that a man who has made a special study of public speaking is better trained than the man who has just observed the phenomenon, and if the trained judge is the best judge, the charge of incompetency cannot be sustained against teachers of public speaking.

A more serious objection to "faculty judging" is the charge of favoritism. It is thought that teachers will have favorites in their classes or fraternities, or will vote for old winners or upper-classmen, or will favor students who are taking courses in their departments. This charge is in a sense true, but in a larger sense false. It is true that teachers form favorable and unfavorable opinions of the speaking possibilities of students under their instruction. They have a chance to study students from week to week and from contest to contest, and the impressions thus gained enter into their decisions as judges of contests. This is a good thing. It tests the wearing qualities of contestants, and gives the judge time to consider more carefully the sources of their power or weakness. It gives the judge a better chance to know the character and personal traits of the contestants. The favoritism that comes from knowledge is on the whole beneficial.

If, however, there are teachers of public speaking so blind to the interests of their profession as to allow fraternity and social connections to outweigh their honest judgment, then even the selection of judges by such teachers is dangerous. Such favoritism should disqualify teachers from any part in the development of the speech possibility of students.

These objections to "faculty judging"—artificiality, incompetency and favoritism—come mostly from students disgruntled by failure to win, and must be expected. They are analogous to

the complaints of students who get lower marks in their class work than they want. They can either be accepted, and their dangerous tendencies nullified by frankness, fairness, and a spirit of helpfulness toward all contestants, or they may be avoided by a firm refusal to judge.

From the point of view of the teacher "faculty judging" has some features that may make us wish to avoid it. It opens us to the criticisms others might make. Our judgment may be questioned and our integrity impugned. Our harmonious relations with our fellow-teachers may be disturbed. We may be called upon to face a real conflict between our judgment and our friendship; between our desire to maintain our standards and the reputation of our school and our impulse to favor friends. One of our alibis for failure to win from other schools will be removed—we can no longer claim that our representatives were selected by incompetent judges. But in spite of these possibilities of personal discomfort our responsibility toward the cause of education in the speech arts makes it imperative for us to take a leading part in speaking contests—in controlling them, in advising contestants and in judging contests, and in instructing and training the winners for higher contests.

The day is past when we can stand aside from these contests and with a half apologetic spirit let them go on. If properly organized, directed, and encouraged they are of great educational value. High-grade judging is vital to their success. To the teachers of public speaking belongs the responsibility for such judging. Whether we judge these contests ourselves, or whether we sit with others of our choosing, or whether we secure judges from other professions, or whether we form a large jury of students of public speaking, the responsibility for high-grade judging is ours, and with it the opportunity to improve the standard of public speech.

I believe that teachers of public speaking should have a dominant part in judging their own contests. Expediency alone would prompt such belief. The necessity of finding a large number of judges each year for contests in oratory and debate makes it plain that the best judges cannot always be secured, and that commonplace judges grow tired of doing a duty which does

not belong to them. It is easier to depend on the teachers of public speaking and a few interested and faithful friends, and the chances for better judging are greatly increased. Such a method gives students more confidence in the judgment rendered, and reduces in their minds the probability of freakish decisions. The outcome of contests ceases to be a mere toss-up and at least assumes the form of expert judgment.

COURSE I IN PUBLIC SPEAKING AT WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

WILBUR JONES KAY
Washington and Jefferson College

COURSE I in public speaking at Washington and Jefferson College is the result of a careful process of development through fifteen years of teaching in this one institution and its aims and methods have been formulated to fit the particular needs of the class of young men who enter this college and not at all with the idea of producing a model course for all colleges.

This institution is a good representative of the small classical college for men, granting the A.B. and B.S. degrees only and having as its object the furnishing of a broad cultural background for life in a democracy and in a narrower sense offering studies in groups that are arranged with the idea in mind of furnishing the best possible preparation for a subsequent pursuit of professional studies in theology, law, or medicine.

The course of study for freshmen prescribes that all who are candidates for a degree must devote four hours per week throughout the year to the work offered in the two departments of Rhetoric and Public speaking. The division of time has been left to the heads of the respective departments to settle between them, and since the professor of rhetoric did not care to offer advanced courses and was satisfied to devote his entire time to the freshman class, while I insisted on offering advanced courses and objected to giving more than one-half of my time to freshmen, it has resulted that the work in public speaking has occupied the equivalent of one hour a week throughout the year. I believe that the best results were obtained when the class met twice a week for two-thirds of the year. Each division of the class contains twenty-five men or fewer if conditions permit.

As Course I is the only course which every man in college must take in the department I try to make it a very practical course in which each man shall have a chance to learn how to use speech as a tool and be afforded the means and the knowledge for developing his powers of speech. Throughout the course

speech is treated as a tool adapted to secure certain useful ends and the aim is to learn how to use it for the purposes to which it is adopted. I seek to afford each member of the class the largest opportunity possible under the conditions for developing the ability to stand up like a man before an audience and speak his mind in such a manner that he will be easily understood and, when he will, may be successful in influencing the beliefs and actions of his listeners.

To accomplish this end a man must first be freed from the fear of an audience insofar as it disturbs the orderly processes of his mind or inhibits the free expression of his opinions and emotions; he must speak loud enough to be heard; and he must learn to adapt his speech to the speech conditions which confront him, making of each occasion a separate and distinct problem to be solved.

These four things constitute the fundamentals of good speaking and are stressed in Course I in the order named. In this course we spend no time on the ornaments and frills of speech but stick to brass tacks.

At the first meeting of the class I occupy the hour in making clear the nature and importance of the work to be undertaken. I try to disabuse their minds of the many false conceptions they have acquired from listening to platform entertainers such as impersonators and popular lecturers, so called. I cite many illustrations, particularly among recent graduates, of how the ability to speak well has opened the way to preferment and rapid rise to success. I show the relation of effective speech to everyday life, that it is as helpful to the man behind the counter, the farmer, the engineer, or the physician as it is to the lawyer or the minister. I try to make each man feel that he can acquire skill in speaking if he will work diligently and intelligently along the lines to be suggested in the class. I do not hold out any promise that he will develop the power and skill of a Webster, a Choate, a Beecher, or a Phillips Brooks, but that he may hope and expect to become a forceful and successful speaker if he has average mentality and is willing to apply himself to the work of Course I.

During the opening weeks of the course each student is called to the floor as often as the time permits and is given from three

to five minutes to talk. The aim is to help him to subdue his fear of the audience and hence little attention is paid to what he says. I ask the class to use the time in relating interesting personal experiences. Anything acquired by reading is banned. Such subjects as vacation experiences, hunting trips, parties, thrilling experiences, interesting work in which one has been engaged, describing a manufacturing process step by step, suggest the nature of the first speeches. I make it a point to show interest in the story and interrupt the speaker frequently with a question or a remark just as I would if we were engaged in informal conversation outside the classroom. I also permit and urge the members of the audience to do the same and thus we bridge over the gap between informal conversation and formal speaking. The student is on the platform facing the audience but he is merely taking the lead in an informal conversation in which all questions and remarks of the audience are addressed to him and relate to the subject of his speech. It is surprising how rapidly this process breaks down the fear which restrains so many men from attempting to speak in public.

As soon as it appears that the speaker's mind has begun to function normally while he is facing the audience I begin to offer criticisms of his speech with the aim of improving his speaking. I believe most criticism wasted that is given upon the first appearances before the class, as many of the faults which show so painfully at that stage disappear with the fear which causes them. Moreover, unless the teacher uses great tact in offering criticism, he is likely to add to or exaggerate the faults rather than remove them for he will increase the student's fear of being humiliated before the class. Only good should be spoken of the speech. If you cannot compliment the student's efforts it is better to say nothing.

We now set forth the purpose of the next speeches. It is assigned as a problem that each man shall select a task for exposition and he is to make it so clear to the class that not a single question will have to be asked of him. He is allowed to use the blackboard to make drawings if he wishes or he may make use of models or objects of any kind and he is encouraged to use concrete illustrations with which the members of the class are

familiar and can easily call up in imagination if they are not actually present before the eye. Particular stress is given at this time to making use of what Phillips calls "Reference to Experience."

All the time I am doing everything possible to develop a keen consciousness of the audience on the part of the speaker and a tenacious holding to his aim throughout the speech. The speaker is required to make a brief statement of his purpose to the class before he begins to attempt its accomplishment. If I detect any tendency to rambling or to forget the audience I immediately interrupt the speaker with a question that is calculated to bring him back to a proper attitude to his subject and audience.

In the preparation of the speeches for the class I urge the men to develop the speech on their feet in a speaking attitude before the class in imagination. I insist as best I can that each man go through his speech thus several times before he attempts to write it and then to write it merely to discover whether he is using any loose or meaningless expressions and to fasten the order of the ideas in his mind. I do not ask for any committed speeches yet and discourage the students from committing. My experience has convinced me that at this stage in attempting to recall what is on the manuscript, the student forgets his audience and his purpose and merely declaims. I am trying to develop in him the power to think intensely while speaking and the use of a committed speech is likely to employ only the faculty of memory.

While I do not allow the students to declaim model speeches of this type before the class, I do urge them to study such speeches and I frequently read good examples before the class and comment on their merits. The addresses delivered in chapel by distinguished visitors offer good material for such comment also.

And we often find excellent material in the newspapers and magazine of current issue. We do not pass to the next type of speeches until the men have gained considerable skill in exposition, narration, and description as I consider the ability to make oneself understood as fundamental to all types of speeches. The only other type of speeches that we study is that which aims to

secure action. Incidentally and naturally we must give considerable attention to the securing of belief but we stress this as a means rather than an end. Beginning with an inquiry into the underlying causes for some of the voluntary actions of the student we develop a consciousness of the power of what Phillips calls "the impelling motives"; I then begin to call attention to the ways in which these impelling motives are employed in good advertising and show how with goods of equal merit, one, through a tactful use of appeal in advertising, will gain a nation-wide sale while the other never attains to more than a local use. I get a copy of the *Saturday Evening Post* or *The Ladies' Home Journal* and turn through the advertising pages with the class calling attention to the use that is made of these impelling motives. I impress the class with the cost of this advertising and with the fact that hard-headed business men do not pay out so much money for sentimental reasons but they expect to get abundant results in sales. I then show how the same motives are used to gain other ends than the sale of goods and have each man relate how his own actions have been influenced by similar appeals. We also call attention to the differences of opinion held by members of the class on questions of policy and fact. We examine our own minds to discover why one believes one thing and another the opposite. This reveals to the men the part which prejudice, desire, environment, and preconceived ideas and opinions play in determining our habits of thinking and our attitude toward new ideas. It necessarily leads us to a discussion of the nature and tests of evidence and of reasoning. As an advanced course in Argumentation and Debating is offered I treat these subjects in Course I in a very elementary way but I aim to give each student a good working knowledge of how to test the truthfulness of facts and the soundness of reasoning and also afford him as much practice as the time will permit in attempting to influence the opinions and actions of the class. I urge the men to seek opportunity for practice in making speeches of this type outside of the classroom and I often send a group of men to a public meeting to participate in the discussion or to furnish the entire program of discussion if requested.

We use as a text in this course Phillips' *Effective Speaking*. I have found this to contain the clearest and most interesting

statement of the problems involved in the types of speeches we study in this course of any text I have examined. We do not have any recitations on the text and we have no examination in theory. We use it merely as a guidebook to supplement the suggestions and criticisms offered in the classroom. It is my practice to attempt to lead the student to formulate his own rules before referring him to any in the text. I do not wish any student to accept a rule until he understands the reasonableness of it and the necessity for it.

I should grossly exaggerate if I should say that at the end of the year every man in the class has become a forceful and finished speaker. But I do not exaggerate when I say that every man who receives credit for the course has shown marked progress toward the attainment of that desired end and that he has a fair command of the tools of speech so that he may continue to make progress if he will continue to make use of what he has learned in Course I. He has acquired an assurance of his power that makes him unafraid to get up and talk when he wants to do so.

Ten years' experience with this course gives me great confidence in its merits. I do not recommend it to inexperienced teachers nor for all conditions. I do not believe any teacher could succeed with such a course unless he had developed the judgment which only a considerable experience can give. One cannot give hard and fast rules of thumb for teaching such a course. Those must be determined largely by the ingenuity of the individual teacher. Every successful teacher is to a great extent original in his methods. It is not likely that any two teachers will succeed equally with the same method. I have no hard and fast rules for teaching anything. I do not believe in such for to my mind each student offers a distinct and different problem to the teacher. When I see a man who claims that he has one way of making speakers of all comers I brand him as a quack. His method smacks of the patent medicine panaceas. The wise teacher proceeds, as does the wise physician, to discover the needs of the particular student before prescribing for him.

You may wonder that I have said nothing of voice training, breath control, gesture, etc. I have never had any success teach-

ing these subjects to a class. I do not say that it can't be done but I can't do it and I have never seen anyone else making such success in doing it as to cause me to envy him. I devote one period to showing the class the value of a well-placed voice and how to secure a proper placing of their own; I also demonstrate how to control the breath while speaking. Further than that all that is done is accomplished through personal criticism and suggestion. I have a little pamphlet of exercises which I give each member of the class, and when he shows any particular fault I assign him the exercise that will correct it if diligently practiced and it is up to him to practice it. I never urge a man to gesture, but if he does so and his gesture is awkward or meaningless I help him to correct it. I believe gesture will take care of itself when the speaker feels the inclination to gesture and if he doesn't feel the inclination he had better not gesture.

CONVICTION AND PERSUASION: SOME CON- SIDERATIONS OF THEORY

CHARLES H. WOOLBERT

Cambridge, Mass.

ARE conviction and persuasion two separate and distinct things? There is something about this question that seems to defy solution; the wise men divide into opposing camps, and the battle goes on. New impetus has been given the subject by the recent discussion of Miss Yost in her article¹ "Argument from the Point of View of Sociology." There she has thrown down the gage to those who accept the two-fold division sanctioned by the usage of centuries. Basing her conclusions upon the data of sociology she contends that the partition of public address into argument and persuasion is meaningless and antiquated. As a further contribution to the subject and as a support to Miss Yost's attitude, I here offer some citations and conclusions from modern psychology. My thesis is that any division of appeal and speech into conviction and persuasion is unsound from the point of view of psychology and unnecessary from the point of view of rhetorical theory.

The answer to this problem lies ready to hand in the findings of psychology; singular it is that we have been so long in gathering the data and using it for our needs. Relying upon rhetoric and composition, we have, as it turns out, built upon shifting sands. Rhetoric as a science has been too much of the study, if not of the arm-chair; too many of the conclusions of the rhetoricians, lacking strict empirical basis, are merely verbal shufflings, and not valid solutions of problems. An excellent illustration of the reliance upon words and pure abstractions of the study-chair is to be found in the customary explanation as to why conviction and persuasion should be looked upon as two different things rather than as one.

Yet despite the age-long tradition of a dualism in the matter of winning a desired response, the concept is going through an evolution. The time-honored view of a two-fold division, clear-cut and definite, which has endured the vicissitudes of several

¹ QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING, III; April, 1917; p. 109 ff.

centuries has become the subject of attack, yet this view still is accepted; we find it set forth fully and frankly by so recent a writer as Foster:³ "Conviction addresses the understanding; it aims to establish belief on rational grounds. But *action* is not often based on purely rational motives. The volition must be secured through arousing the emotions. This is the work of persuasion." Baker and Huntington⁴ see a flaw in the fencing-off concept; they moderate it to the statement: "The two (conviction and persuasion) are complementary, one being the warp the other the woof of argumentation." This is an attitude judiciously chosen; but it loses its vantage when it is later supplanted by the same concept as that of Foster's. What else may we say of it when the text asserts (p. 10), "The history of argumentation shows that usually conviction is preceded or followed by persuasion"! But warp and woof cannot be envisaged as following one another in straight-line sequence; they give us solely a picture of intricate interlocking and interweaving. Later (p. 263) this text slips still farther away when the authors allow themselves to say (p. 10), "He who only persuades runs the dangers of all excited action." Obviously the two things are here looked upon as two distinctly different entities. Yet the authors come back again to the original woof and warp ground by saying later (p. 11), "But a reader should never forget that this separation is artificial and made wholly for pedagogic reasons."

Other writers during the past two decades take positions differing from these chiefly in verbal statement only. Alden,⁵ for example, remarks: "One may wish to induce his hearers not only to agree with his doctrine but to *act* upon it; and experience shows that action does not by any means always follow conviction." Ketcham⁶ comes near to taking a new stand when he says: "The end of argumentation is action. It may be only an action of the mind resulting in a definite belief which will exert an influence in the world for good or evil. It may be the desire of the one who argues to persuade his hearers to advocate his opinions and beliefs . . . It may be that some more decided

³*Argumentation and Debate*; Boston, 1908; p. 262.

⁴*Principles of Argumentation*; New York, 1905; p. 10.

⁵*The Art of Debate*; New York, 1900; pp. 4 and 5.

⁶*Argumentation and Debate*; New York, 1914; p. 5.

physical action is desired . . . It may be the taking up of arms against a state. . . . Here everything is action; there is no room for a separate division of conviction. It is a step forward. But later this author lapses when he speaks in the traditional strain (p. 121): "The main part of the argument which is contained in the proof carries forward the work of persuasion." This time they evidently are two, and evidently distinguishable one from the other. As also when he says (p. 94), "The distinction between conviction and persuasion . . . again enters into the argumentative process."

The latest bow to the traditional attitude renders service in no uncertain manner; let doubters beware! Stone and Garrison⁶ make bold to declare: "It is difficult to imagine two processes more dissimilar than these two methods of influencing human thought. Conviction rigidly excludes from consideration anything which is emotional in its nature." One could almost suspect that a lawyer had had something to do in the framing of that sentence! But what shall we say of such wholehearted allegiance to the view it presents? Is it in harmony with the obvious trend of rhetorical theory? We shall see.

For the verdict is far from unanimous. Doubt has come over the authorities who write on this subject. The first noteworthy break from the past reveals a sharp refusal to be content with a two-fold division. Phillips⁷ in naming his "general ends" of speech, instead of two chooses five as the basis of his division. Of his five two are called by the names *belief* and *action*. The others are *clearness*, *impressiveness*, and *entertainment*. This pioneer move toward freedom from the elder rhetoricians, however, makes the mistake of adding instead of subtracting; it turns to the left instead of to the right. Such classifications as those given by Phillips are very far from mutually exclusive; for to be clear is often to be at the same time impressive, establish belief, move to action, and even be delightfully entertaining. To be impressive is to create a mental state so much like action as to be inseparable from it; beside no action is possible without impressiveness of some kind. Again, clearness, belief, and entertainment are all so many kinds of impressiveness. And so on;

⁶*The Essentials of Argument*, 1916.

⁷*Effective Speaking*; Chicago, 1908.

the list is helpful in making practicable outlines for speeches, but not in solving problems of rhetorical theory.

The most recent attempt to answer this conundrum is so full and careful in its treatment that it merits in its turn only treatment of a like care. Winans⁸ gives more than two pages (185-187) to citations and discussions of the issue, arriving at the conclusion (p. 186, footnote), "The distinction (between belief and action) seems to me to be a valuable one." But this single statement does not do justice to Winans' position, for on pages 247 and 248 he declares that "no hard and fast distinction should be understood here, only an emphasizing of the fact that there may be two phases of one process." This seeming contradiction is explained in the light of what Winans considers the guiding principle of his system, "The key-word is Attention." (p. xiii.) Belief and persuasion he says are both matters of "inducing others to give fair, favorable, or undivided attention to propositions." (p. 194.) Thus his chief concern is to show how readers and hearers are affected by attention.

So on page 271 he feels no compunctions about speaking of "persuasive argument" and on page 273 of "both persuasion and conviction," and on page 185 declares that persuasion as he uses the term "is not limited to inducing physical acts, but includes changing the mental attitude, as by removing prejudice, bringing about a fair-minded attitude toward a person, a willingness to consider a proposition, or a desire to accept it." We must not overlook also the one additional consideration that in the preface (p. viii) the author recommends that with his book "should be used a book on argumentation," and that he gives only "incidental attention" to "such topics as the rules of evidence, fallacies, the analysis and briefing of arguments." This gives us a clear indication that he feels an essential difference between the concept of persuasion and the concept of motionless, rational conviction as set off, say, by Foster or Stone and Garrison.

This vigorous effort to solve the problem, revealing as it does the great complexity of it, still leaves some prickly doubts; and it is to deal with these that this paper is written. The issue can be stated in various ways: (1) Are belief and action two different entities, or are they one and the same thing? (2)

⁸*Public Speaking*; New York, 1917.

Shall we speak of conviction *and* persuasion, or use one term for both? (3) Can all processes induced in a hearer or reader be described by the same concept, or must we use two, and even more? If we answer that the processes are essentially different, then we face, despite the presumption implied by centuries of use, certain subsidiary questions: (a) Precisely where does one method end and the other begin? (b) What are the terms that accurately describe their essential differences? (c) Can we conceive of conviction and persuasion as essentially different but nevertheless as guided by a single common principle? These must be answered.

But, on the other hand, if we contend that the process is one and one only, we then face questions like these: (a) In what terms can you state the unity so that there will be no omissions? (b) How do you explain away a duality so easily apparent and so obviously useful? (c) What is the one law that governs all the phenomena of speech and appeal—argumentation, conviction, persuasion, entertainment, exposition? (d) How can such a law be stated so as to fit all cases? Answers to these questions will be hinted at in various ways throughout this paper, but inasmuch as each of them is worthy of treatment at least as full as the length of this article, they can be only summarized at this time.

Let me say plainly here, what I have already indicated, that I see no hope for a solution from rhetoricians and lexicographers. Belief, argument, persuasion, reasoning—nothing other than ways of influencing the mind; mental processes can be described and explained only in terms of psychology; the solution of the difficulty, accordingly, is to be found in psychology alone. I cannot help feeling that if the authorities cited had sought the solution of this problem, as some have done for parts of their texts, in what psychology has to offer, they could have given their readers a more modern statement of the facts or else would have presented a single clear impression incapable of ambiguities.

Psychologists present a strikingly solid front on this issue. For them there is only one concept that describes what happens when an organism is stimulated in any and all possible ways, and that concept is expressed in the term *action*, or its synonyms, *activity* and *reaction*—as the psychologist uses them—all mean

fundamentally the same thing. Beginning with the purely chemical change that takes place in, say, the taste buds or the retina, or the physical change involved in the vibration of the end organs of the ear, and going on up to the complex processes described as perception and emotion, or thence to such intricacies as solving a problem in calculus or enlisting for war—the term *action* does universal and satisfactory service. Terms used by the psychologist to suggest divisions into mental processes are not meant to denote any differentiation into action and that-which-is-not-action. So the terms sensation, feeling, association, perception, ideation, emotion, attention, will, while useful for psychological description, are understood as having reference to aspects of the larger whole—action; or let us use a word in many ways better suited to our purposes, and one that will be used freely in the future—*response*.⁹

Now for the evidence presented by the psychologists. James says,¹⁰ "All mental states (no matter what their character as regards utility may be) *are followed by bodily activity of some sort*. They lead to inconspicuous changes in breathing, circulation, general muscular tension, and glandular or other visceral tension, even if they do not lead to conspicuous movements of the muscles of voluntary life. Not only certain states of mind (such as those called volitions) but states of mind as such, *all* states of mind, even mere thoughts and feelings, are motor in their consequences."

Munsterberg gives us a statement that is precisely to the point of this discussion:¹¹ "Our real action is not the movements

⁹As a matter of fact, speaking and appeal can be completely described in terms of any of the complex mental processes, such as association, perception, attention, emotion, or will. Winans has shown that it can be done in terms of attention. It seems to me, however, that action, and particularly response, is the fundamental concept. What the speaker is seeking when he makes a speech is a certain *response* from his hearers. As a description of this response, attention is only incidental, only a way station. Still more strictly, attention is only one way of describing and picturing the configurations and patterns of unitary responses which are sometimes multitudinous in number. A theory of persuasion based upon action as response, is the next step in the progress of the science. Also it is directly in line with the psychology of such recent writers as Pawlow, Sherrington, Freud, MacDougall, Munsterberg, Judd, Dewey, Holt, and others.

¹⁰*Psychology: Briefer Course*; p. 5; 1912.

¹¹*Psychology General and Applied*; New York, 1914; p. 162.

of our arms and fingers, of our lips and vocal cords, but the reorganization of our motor centres."

Colvin¹² gives us almost a motion picture of this inner activity when he says: "The simplest activity of the nervous system is represented as due to a stimulus affecting an end organ, traversing a sensory nerve to a specific brain center or centers and then transferring itself to a motor nerve that innervates a muscle and results in an adjustment." Note the verbs used here; every one would be applicable to the performances of a man taking a truck-load of goods from one depot to another; they are all descriptive of action and activity. And Judd,¹³ employs the following expressions as side headings: "Activity does not necessarily mean movement." "Every kind of impression—light, color, smell—produces activity." "Changes in motor activity and circulatory activity accompany subjective changes." (By "subjective changes" he means what is commonly called ideas, images, and feelings.) "Involuntary hand movements reflect subjective changes."

But some will say, "That is all well enough for psychology; yet in practical matters of speech there is a clear-cut division adequately described by the accepted meanings of the words, conviction and persuasion; why then needlessly squeeze the two into one?" Isn't it legitimate to speak of "physical" and "mental" acts? The question is a good one and must be met; it carries with it a strong presumption that cannot be ignored. My first reply is this; once we submit our problems to the court of psychology, we must abide by the decisions and the laws of evidence enforced in that court. I fear we shall have only a sorry patchwork if we solve one problem by psychology and another, vitally interwoven with it, by a combination of rhetoric, dictionary meanings, and everyday usage. The psychologist cannot today make any distinction between "physical" action and "mental" action; to him it is one and the same thing. Mind and body are two aspects of the same entity; all action is both of the mind and of the body; there can be no separation which implies that mind exists somewhere else than in the body or that

¹²*The Learning Process*; p. 33.

¹³*Psychology*; General Introduction; Chapter VII, Experience and Expression, pp. 182-212. (I strongly recommend this chapter. C. H. W.)

it exists in any one bodily member. Mind and body are so inextricably interwoven that such a solution ignores the fundamental realities and is purely verbal.

My second answer to the query as to why we cannot be satisfied with the division into physical acts and mental acts, is that it offers no two divisions that are mutually exclusive. Let us make an arbitrary, though representative list of the activities of the mind—including those that involve, of course, the body. Take the following list: sensation, ideation, conception, feeling, attention, perception, memory, association, judgment, belief, emotion, choice, assent, a nod, an uttered word, a raising of the hand, rising to one's feet, coming forward, casting a vote, paying money, subscribing, and rushing forth to deeds of violence. Now observe that along about the words "choice, assent, a nod, an uttered word, a raising of the hand," we appear to go from "thinking" to "acting" in a way to give color to the old-time dichotomy. And I would be one of the last to insist that the shift is not real or is not of considerable significance. But when we try to fix a hard and fast line, we immediately face difficulties; our division does not divide the way we think it ought to. Take the action implied in the word *nod*; is there any fundamental difference to a speaker between an outer nod visible to the eye and the inner nod that merely is the tightening of certain muscles and the accelerating of the blood flow in a given manner? Surely not in so far as securing a response is concerned; where there is stimulation of any kind there is response, and that means action.

The same applies to the use of words. If a speaker gets a man to vote Yes, orally or on paper, we have no difficulty in calling it an act. What, then, of the case where the hearer merely says his Yes to himself in the muscles of the mouth and larynx; is the effect as response any different? Decidedly not; in both cases alike the man has responded. Likewise, if the hearer merely experiences an increased blood pressure, a hardening of the muscles of the arm and leg, or a change in the configuration of active cortical cells that means apprehension of a meaning? All are action and cannot be made meaningful in any category of non-action.

Life is full of these invisible activities. There is not a moment of our existence that we are not doing something; *and*

a proper description of the action at any time would have to be made in terms of the whole organism, every act is of the whole machine. Assuredly, then, when we are being stimulated by a speaker, we are as busy as a hive of bees, and with an activity frequently quite as hidden from the eye of an observer. Our neurones are in a constant state of agitation and change; our blood flow is now fast, now slow; our viscera sink, rise, or churn; our breathing is accelerated or retarded; our muscles twitch or become set; the whole machine is one coördinated concatenation of activity and inner movements.

The facts are well illustrated by the phenomenon of automatic writing. If by a screen one shuts off the right hand so that it cannot be seen and then places it on a ouija board provided with a pencil that rests upon a sheet of paper, and then if one looks at pictures or listens to another reading aloud, it will be discovered that, entirely unknown to the subject, he has written words and even sentences or has made all kinds of marks on the paper.¹⁴ The livelong day some of us continually sing, drum with the fingers, tighten the jaw, and perform countless like acts entirely out of sight or sound of an observer. To be alive is to be constantly in a state of activity. Without cessation or interruption we respond the whole day through to the stimuli of impressions from without and within.

Therefore, in all matters of human experience, whatever events can be brought under the term *response* must be conceived as also belonging to the term *action*; any classification that denies this must thereby ignore the organic nature of mind, and can be only a loose and meaningless manipulation of words. Response, and response of all possible kinds, must be conceived of as action, or else the term action is entirely useless for purposes of theory and practice. And this compulsion is as great upon the science of rhetoric as it is upon the science of psychology.

But somewhere here is an important difference, on that all seem agreed. Where is it to be found? How can we state it? Evidently something that looks like a dichotomy into action and not-action has got itself mistaken for the real thing; what is this interloper and where is it to be found? The answer is

¹⁴Jastrow: *Fact and Fable in Psychology*; Boston, 1901; Chapter on "A Study of Involuntary Movements," pp. 307-336.

clear: the error of the conviction-persuasion, emotion-intellect, thought-action duality is found in the fact that we discuss this issue, not in terms of what the responder actually does, but in terms of what the observer perceives him doing. What we have been talking about for ages in our rhetorical theory is not what the actor does, but what a spectator can detect by eye and ear. *It is a difference, not between acting and thinking, but between one kind of action that happens also to be perceivable movement and another kind of action in which the movement is invisible and unperceivable.* But this is not a difference between action and not-action.

But someone objects. Isn't this division the very one we need for practical purposes of rhetorical theory? Let us consider this question; there is something behind it. For if we go on making our division at this point where movement changes from invisible to visible, we are confronted with certain inescapable implications; and if we cannot face them successfully, our old theory falls. When we put up a bar, it must shut the sheep in one fold and the goats in the other. Of course, we might simply assert that the division explains itself, that it is self-evident as necessary to rhetorical method. But inasmuch as no text that I know of offers perceivable movement as the basis of a bifurcation, we can dismiss this first alternative. So we turn to the explanations that lie more or less hidden behind the traditional dichotomy.

First, there is the concept of *complexity*; it may easily be offered in defense that we need a division because of the difference in intricacy and number of the functions employed; action is more complicated than thinking yet this rests upon a fundamental misconception; there can easily be greater complexity of response in working out a stiff problem when not even the slightest movement is perceivable than in jumping up and shouting "Let's go fight Philip!" Many of our visible movements are so thoroughly automatic that they are performed with a minimum of mental processes; in the psychologist's terminology, they are performed in the lower reflex levels. On the other hand, abstract, conceptual thinking may keep the whole nervous system at work from the lowest spinal arcs to the top of the cortex. This division clearly overlaps.

Can this division, secondly, be explained in terms of effort and strain? Again, No; some of the most gruelling experiences we undergo are endured without visible motion. Frequently applause, shouting, or rushing from the hall involve much less exertion than just sitting still and seeing red while we hide our feelings. Then again we can be utterly exhausted by passively listening to a noise and in turn can be actually refreshed by running, jumping, tugging, and straining. The essential activity is in the nerves, not the muscles. So this division overlaps also.

Can the differentiation then be *duration*, the length of time involved in the action? The same answer must be given again. Motile action may come quickly or it may come slowly; we may flare up suddenly, yell, throw up our hats, and parade around the hall, all upon an instant's impulse; or we may wait until the next day, or the next year before we vote or shoot, or sign the papers. So also action entirely non-motile may be fast or slow; we may make our decision immediately upon the perception of a stimulus, or we may let it incubate for days, months, and years. Thus perceivable movement can be satisfactory as the basis for a rhetorical division neither on the grounds of complexity of the process, the effort involved, nor the duration of the experience.

But why is not the difference to be found in the often-expressed distinction between emotional states and states non-emotional, or intellectual? For a very good reason; both are states of activity. The only proper way to describe them is in terms of types of response. They are emphatically in the same category. An emotion is a highly integrated and organized set of actions touched off by a stimulus free from inhibitions and interruptions; it goes straight down one road unchecked and even blindly. The intellectual type of activity is also highly organized but it is one that operates in the face of difficulties, checks, obstructions, excursions, and retreats. It must halt at crossings before going ahead and must pick and choose its steps with deliberation and foresight. They are at one in being complexes of actions; both may or may not be accompaniments of

visible movement; and they cannot be differentiated in terms of action and non-action.¹⁵

Many of our most stirring emotions, hidden like the Spartan boy's fox, eat at our vitals and yet reveal no sign of their presence; while our coolest judgments may send us to the ends of the earth or drive us to acts of the greatest violence. Emotions and perceived movements are not synonymous; to imply that emotional stir is needed to get us to walk, write, or to reach, into our pockets, while to think, believe, and accept come always without emotion, is to get one's psychology hopelessly twisted. Much of our motionless activity is highly emotional, and many of our most strenuous movements are clearly intellectual. So to solve the movement problem, we must find some other line of cleavage; for we still feel that it represents a division that is real and significant.

Still, one more commonly-used explanation of this traditional division remains; that between action instigated rationally and action instigated non-rationally. Is this the same as the emotion-intellectual division? Often they are regarded as synonymous. But if they are the same thing in different terms, then obviously the explanation is open to the objections just stated. However, there is an even better reason for rejecting these concepts as explanatory of the dualism. A speech or appeal, stripped of all reasoning and given up wholly to non-rational processes, is unthinkable. Every kind of address or speech rests in some degree on reason. Reason in speech and writing is a matter of orderliness, consistency, regularity, system, plan. In a strict sense *non-rational*, as applied to composition, is synonymous with muddled, futile, merely exclamatory. If there is sequence, from, order, there is some element of rationality present. But the conventional division contemplates no such meaning as this; accordingly we have no alternative than to declare that a division on the basis of rationality cannot be alleged as the same one intended by the division into conviction and persuasion.

So we have not yet stated a satisfactory basis for dividing at movement. Assuming now that we accept action, or response,

¹⁵Just to suggest how easily we confound these terms: this very article, all would agree, is what we call intellectual stuff. Yet it is written under definite and strong emotional excitement, and very likely may stir up other emotions of a rather vigorous nature.

as the single category needed. If, then, we can give a satisfactory answer why a line has been so consistently drawn at the point where movement is detectable, we can remove the greatest source of doubt as to the validity of the monistic treatment of theory. And this answer is to be found by following the cue given by Miss Yost in the paper referred to above, *a speech or an argument always implies a social situation*. Here we have an adequate reason. The social situation involved in speech-making and in listening as an auditor is felt most acutely when an observer can detect by eye and ear that the speaker has hit home, that he has moved his hearers. The best basis for such perception is movement and sound. Applause, laughter, agitation, writing down subscriptions, giving money, registering votes, "hitting the trail," rising to rush forth, burning and killing—all give evidence that the audience has succumbed and has made obeisance, that the speaker is victorious. Thenceforth the struggle implied between speaker and hearer is a closed incident and some things have suddenly become irrevocable.

Often thus to yield openly is painful if not fateful; it has consequences; we give ourselves away when we vowed we would not; we feel that we have sold out. Accordingly we cultivate, as we grow in sophistication, a pose that keeps all the activity locked up out of sight, no matter how hot the bearings may become or what internal combustion may take place. As much as possible we cut movement to a minimum; and we may even earn the praise of being unemotional, unexcitable, forsooth intellectual, when in fact, we undergo more real activity twice over than men who blow up with a loud report amid a great scattering of arms and legs and hair. Thus it is entirely possible to give a satisfactory reason why we have long accepted this difference, *for movement, as a response to a speaker, has vital consequences socially*.

These consequences are far-reaching and penetrating. If an act is not good form socially, if it "isn't done" by our set, we do our best to hold in. Especially when we take pride in our schooling and training, the ingrained tendency is to bottle up our activities for fear of making a spectacle of ourselves before our neighbors. We refrain from letting the explosion break out until we find out whether the man behind us or beside us is going

to explode too. It is agonizingly painful to be the only one to haw haw or to sniffle or to hold up one's hand. And very often when we do at last break out, we make it a good one and clear out our system while we are at it. Once the crust breaks, the greater the pressure the louder the noise.

For these two reasons, then, movement is hard to secure from an audience. We simmer or boil, cool or freeze undiscovered if we can work it that way. Because if we tilt the lid or tip over the vessel, everybody is going to know it, and then we have to pay the price; the secret is out and we stand committed before our little world. So we have a way of putting a speaker to his best trumps to get any visible or audible sign out of us; we habitually defy him to make us show down. And this is the reason, I am convinced, that rhetorical tradition has drawn the line at perceived movement. The difference is one easy to detect, in plain sight. Also a dichotomy has fitted in with the old conception of separating the intellect from the emotions, thought from action, conviction from persuasion, soul from body; and so the men who have written on rhetoric, from Aristotle down, aided and abetted by the dictionary makers, have filled our texts and loaded our speech with terms that rest on this dualism. For common needs it still has its uses; very often we are interested in the audience's overt movements more than in those that are hidden; and also when a speech has movement for its aim, its success must be measured by the movement secured. (Rider)

But when we essay a theory of persuasion, argumentation, appeal—call it what you will—we shall go astray as surely as we do not see that every possible response a speaker can get from his audience is an action, whether it be merely understanding his words or snatching up the banners and raging around the hall. I agree emphatically with Winans in calling the process by one name, persuasion; because it deals with only one entity, and of all terms possible persuasion is the largest and most inclusive. Moreover, it is traditionally associated with the appeal for action, and if action is the sole object of speech, then persuasion is the fitting term to use. Argumentation means nothing in popular parlance; it is a made-up term of limited significance; it has a sound purely formal; and is used only in an academic

and doctrinaire sense. Persuasion covers the whole ground, suggests efforts worthy of the best in a man, and still has meaning in everyday usage.

But this discussion is leaving unanswered a host of questions that fairly bristle. If we reject the old division into conviction and persuasion, on what basis do we get any divisions at all? Obviously a working method must have joints and members; what must they be? Differences in situations exist; how do you classify them to fit this notion? And as it is harder to induce hearers to respond with noticeable movement than otherwise, it is sound practice, as a matter of the science of rhetoric, to lay down rules to meet the two different situations. For a sample rule: "To cause a man or a crowd to respond openly, appeal through *social* impulses more than when you are trying to get him to respond covertly." The need herein involved would be completely covered, I believe, by a division of motives into *social and nonsocial* and then by showing how to apply the two different types to different situations. Then too how do you fit logic and reason into such a scheme? These are fair and vital questions.

But there is not space here even to begin; each is a long story in itself, and none is without its answer. Suffice it to say that a theory and method of persuasion is possible that will clear away the haziness that now prevails. It will be one that will recognize the monism of action; that will not concern itself with any division of the mind into intellect, emotions, and will; that will take the woof and warp figure of Baker and Huntington at its full value and hold to it; that will perceive that if attention is the key of persuasion we must not tolerate a dualism which prevents us from showing how it unlocks all possible processes; that will make the hearer the basis of all divisions and not the subject-matter; (See Miss Yost's strictures on Foster; Op. At. supra) that will reveal the full influence that social relations play in securing response; and finally, that will state the accepted principles of composition and rhetoric in terms of stimulus-response, stimulation-action. Whoever takes up these problems will have no difficulty in finding, right here in the twentieth century, abundant opportunity to add "new principles

of dealing with the subject" even though it may have been, as we are told,¹⁶ "an old story before the Christian era."

By way of brief summary, then, this paper aims at the following conclusions: (1) As a matter of the theory of public address and appeal, all dualistic attitudes separating response into action and non-action are untenable and misleading. (2) The dichotomy into perceived movement and movement not perceived, to which the rhetorical theory of tradition is committed, is restricted in its application to one of many subsidiary hints with respect to differences in method, but is not a difference of a major character. (3) The whole theory of argumentation, conviction, persuasion, the rhetoric of public address, must be rewritten to fit the facts of mind as accepted today; which will be tantamount to restating them in terms of stimulus-response, object-subject, and environment-attitude.

¹⁶Stone and Garrison, *Op. cit.*, preface.

TEACHING READING AND SPELLING AS FUNCTIONS OF PERSONALITY

J. S. GAYLORD

University of Wisconsin

THE following notes have been selected from a rather extensive collection of questions, problems, discussions, quotations, remarks, exclamations, etc., which have been gathered in recent years in an effort to understand the deeper aspects of reading and speaking and in order to determine the technique and the methods which are most promising in teaching these subjects as functions of personality. The text is, "for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh"; the context is a class in the fundamentals of public speaking. The treatment is both theoretical and practical.

The term public speaking is to be understood as including all of the various ways in which human beings communicate one with another by means of spoken language, whether the speaker uses his own words or the words of another.

The first big problem, for the teacher as well as for the student, is to become clearly conscious of and to respond generously to the whole situation within which the speaking occurs and from which it derives its meanings. This situation includes the environment, the audience (the social group), the speaker, the subject-matter about which he speaks, the occasion (the purpose for which the social group has been formed), the speaking itself, and certain interrelations among or between all of these.

The next thing to do is to develop a consciousness of and a response to each of these aspects in the atmosphere of the whole situation and in harmony with the others. There seems to be a normal ratio between each aspect and the whole which we should earnestly seek to secure and to maintain. Only a large amount of experimental work can decide how much consciousness the speaker should have of his audience, of his subject-matter, of himself, etc., in order to do his best work. There are some hints that the more consciousness the speaker has of the whole situa-

tion and of all of its parts the better, provided the normal ratio is preserved.

The speaker presents four important aspects as we view him in his setting in a class in public speaking, namely, his environment, his body, his mind, and his inner self, his personality. These are to be viewed as functions rather than as substances. Through the body impressions come from the environment to the mind and set it into action, and through the body and mind the inner self is aroused to self-activity.

The formula of learning may be stated in a series of processes as follows: Impression, central process, expression, return impression, increased central process, enriched expression, further return impression, etc., in a spiral procedure.

By impression we mean the processes by which the stimuli from the environment and from the parts of the body are sent in to the brain and arouse the mind to action. Eight kinds of mental action are so produced, namely, seven kinds of sensations (corresponding to the seven kinds of sense organs in the body), and feelings, the bodily origin of which has not been determined with certainty.

The central processes are sensations, perceptions, images, ideas, thoughts, etc., which differ in complexity and in degree of development. Recent studies in human behavior have emphasized the conception of levels in consciousness or of genetic depths of impression and reaction. Some actions show on their faces that they are shallow, others that they are deep. A convenient way of presenting this conception to oneself is by picturing the impressions as turning about and coming out at different distances within the mind or self. The importance of this view is apparent in teaching one to be self-active in reading or in speaking. The deeper the impression the more sincere one seems to be and the more meaning he communicates to others. Abandonment to the truth is another form in which the deeper levels are suggested. There is no more important problem in education today than how to lead the students to receive deeper impressions and to express themselves from a deeper source of meaning. The first of these makes them appreciate more richly and the second makes them more eloquent.

Expression is the outward flowing of nervous stimuli to the muscles and the actions produced by the contraction of these muscles. Both voluntary and involuntary muscles are to be included. The voluntary muscles are organized into six more or less unified groups, namely, those producing voice, facial expression, head movements, gestures of the arms and hands, movements of the trunk of the body, and movements of the legs and feet. Each of these groups not only has a share in all expression but also has certain things to do which it can do better than can any other part of the body.

The return impressions come from what the speaker is doing as he expresses. They come through or from the muscles chiefly with the help of the eyes and the ears. One's ability to become conscious of what he is doing determines his learning to a very large extent. Is it true that the more conscious of what he is doing one becomes the faster he learns? These new impressions join with the original impressions and together they bring about more adequate central processes, which in turn get more fully expressed, and so on. The depth of the impression which one secures depends in great degree upon the emphasis which is put upon the return impressions from the positions and movements of one's own body.

The history of education in the United States shows three modes of treatment in the teaching of reading and speaking. The order of this development has been from the shallower views to the deeper and more fundamental. All three modes are now in use, more or less mixed with other modes.

The first of these modes is mechanical, external, formal, synthetic, and physical. It views speaking as a function of the body. The parts are to be learned first and then put together in accordance with certain rules and regulations. One learns not by being spontaneous, but by receiving suggestions and directions from without and then by consciously directing his bodily movements accordingly. To get the forms perfected is the first and most important part of the training. As much meaning will afterward be put in as may be. When the student has learned to manipulate his voice and his gesture in a skillful way he then begins to put these actions together in series corresponding to the selection which he is reading or the speech which he is wording.

The second mode of treatment is functional, internal, analytic, and mental. Speaking and reading are now viewed as functions of the mind. The student is to concentrate his attention on what his mind is doing and to learn to control the activities of his mind so that he can make his mind do whatever he wishes to have it do. When reading a selection or giving a speech he puts in those mental activities which he has already chosen as most appropriate for the purpose in hand, namely, the rendering of the words in his speech or selection. The subject-matter is analyzed into small parts and the mental actions corresponding to these parts are selected. These ways of working belong to the thought methods. This control of the mental processes makes it possible to permit the bodily actions to be spontaneous because of the belief that whatever the mind does the body will express effectively if it is not interfered with.

The third mode has been hinted occasionally all along the historic way, but it has only recently come into clear consciousness. According to this view reading and speaking are functions of the inner self, the personality, the soul. This view is organic, total, real, analytic-synthetic, and personal. The whole person is to be engaged in expression and impression. The speaker is a whole person communicating in a significant way with other persons in order to fulfill some life purpose. Speaking is not a putting together of parts (either physical or mental) which have been prepared beforehand, but it is a bringing into prominence of aspects of a living, growing, and perfecting personality. It is not a mosaic, but a growing organism. Both the mental and the bodily actions are to be spontaneous, while the inner self is to be controlled. Through the body and the mind impressions are received from the world without and through the mind and the body expressions find a way out to other persons.

Our present problem is to find out what this new view is and means and how we may secure personality reactions of a deeper and deeper sort. But how is one to learn to respond more deeply? Can one will to be deeper and have the result follow the volition immediately or must one get the depth of response indirectly? The important thing seems to be to make the conditions favorable for the impression to go on in instead of coming out so soon.

What attitude of the mind is most favorable for this? Certain things seem to be helpful, such as an expectant attitude, a "wise passiveness," a "restless eagerness," etc. Certain emotional experiences, such as enthusiasm, love, patriotism, sometimes reach the very depths of human nature and so cause one to quite excel himself. Certain physical and mental exercises will arouse the personality in a deep way when they are used for that purpose. We need to work out a series of activities to use as means of getting deeper and deeper personal responses. We are familiar with the fact that physical activity tends to intensify mental action. Going a step further we notice that certain forms of bodily action are favorable for an increase in the depth of impression and so in the depth of meaning. By using these exercises the rearer or speaker can prepare himself for his public utterances in such a way as to appeal to his audiences in a far deeper level than when he does not so prepare. Such exercises tend to bring out the inner aspects more than the outer ones. They leave more opportunity for spontaneity of mental and bodily action as the message is being delivered. The rule is for the speaker to use as deep a level as he can successfully, always realizing that he can feel deeper than he can express, that he has possibilities of impression which are far ahead of his ability to produce. We can understand and appreciate a Shakespeare or a Beethoven, but we cannot write or play in the same class with them. Growth in receptivity always keeps several years in advance of growth in expressive power. It is this which gives the great and wonderful men audiences to whom they can speak and by whom they can be understood and appreciated. If we could understand only what we could produce in a concrete way we should be seriously handicapped in our efforts to become educated.

The problem of teaching public speaking turns out to be more complex and difficult than has generally been supposed. Expressive power seems to be due in large part to the depth of impression secured in the study of the subject-matter and in response to the whole situation. Nothing does more for the success of the teaching process than to emphasize the impression. Of course the central processes and the expression are important, but they have received too much attention in proportion to the depth of the impression.

Ordinarily the only part of public speaking to be analyzed is the subject-matter. Effective utterance demands an analysis of the audience, the environment, the occasion, and the speaker himself. The purpose of analyzing these is not to keep them in the center of attention, but to have them as a background for the speaking. The masterly insight into the situation which comes from a careful analysis of each aspect is very important in determining the degree of success of the speaker.

When attention is given to the bodily actions of the speaker he has very little chance to be spontaneous. When attention is directed to the subject-matter or to the mental action of the speaker his voice, gesture, etc., may be quite spontaneous. Improvement is then to be made by changing the mental activities, since they carry with them the corresponding changes in bodily actions. When one bases his work on the personality of the speaker both his mental and his physical actions may be spontaneous. Improvement now depends upon making such changes in self-activity, in one's personality reactions, that the spontaneous actions of the body and the mind will become efficient.

What a service public speaking can render when it teaches students to respond deeply to some of the best things in literature and in life! Then they will learn to put their whole souls into what they are doing, to throw themselves into their work in a whole-hearted way and to grow in character as well as in physical and mental skill.

To cultivate the habit of communicating with others in a deep and growing way is a most important part of a student's preparation for his life work. One who can so communicate will become a leader in the more important enterprises in his community and nation. Small talk has a place in our civilization, but what we need to be sure to include in the education of every young man and every young woman is a chance to learn how to speak to a social group in a profound way and with full devotion to some worthy cause.

One helpful thing to do is to recall some experience which moved you deeply and, keeping the effects of the recalled experience intense, to give your message in the atmosphere of these deep and vital effects. Such practice gradually makes it possible for one to strike the deeper levels when he wishes to do so.

Before speaking can be taught satisfactorily the genetic order of the development of the powers of effective and artistic utterance must be discovered and made into a program or system. Several systems for the development of the mind have been worked out and used by teachers of public speaking. Who will make such a study for the development of personality through reading and speaking? The one who does will render a great service not only to teachers of public speaking, but also to all teachers as well.

The way to become profound is not by learning a little of many things, but by getting deeper and deeper impressions from a few things, in their more fundamental meanings. To do this one must be willing to use his body and his mind in a persistent way again and again. He must find out what bodily movements are most conducive to his personal growth and then practice these movements conscientiously until he gets the habit of responding deeply whenever he wishes to do so. Then he must learn to do those things with his mind which are most helpful for the same purpose. The natural way in is from the environment to the body, then to the mind, then through it to the inner self. Such practices make one feel as if there were something magical about the situation, but when one realizes that all the experiences we get depend more or less upon muscular sensations he does not feel so surprised to find that certain actions of the body help more to stir up personality than do others.

Two big problems confront us: first is how to make a sound diagnosis, the second is how to prescribe for the students after the diagnosis has been made and verified. These two aspects of the work in public speaking are so important that we must do everything in our power to bring them into prominence in the near future. What are the fundamental things in learning to make a sound diagnosis? First, to learn to treat each student both as an individual and as a member of a certain society group. Each student becomes a case to be recorded in great detail as soon as we know how to make such a record scientifically important. The teacher must not observe the actions of the students, but interpret them. To learn to interpret deeper than the student expresses is necessary to decide what prescription to give him in

order that he may grow in the truest way. Merely to correct what he has already done gives the student a shallow habit of expression.

Teachers of reading and speaking are not advised to make a sudden transition in their teaching from the use of subject-matter to an appeal to personality. The personal method should be lived with a long time before being adopted, and when it is understood theoretically its practical use should be introduced very gradually. A rather strenuous effort to deepen the meaning of what one is saying is a good way to make a start in the use of the deeper personal methods.

ACCESSORY SINUSES AND HEAD RESONANCE

GLENN NEWTON MERRY

University of Iowa

THERE seems to be considerable disagreement among voice specialists and physicists concerning the part played in head resonance by the accessory sinuses. In our unpretentious speaking voice laboratory at the University of Iowa I am engaged in some studies which I hope will cast some additional light upon the relation.

Our laboratory furnishes the opportunity of observation and the formation of conclusions based upon a multitude of observations. While our work is limited chiefly to resonance we find it necessary to make careful analysis of the action of the respiratory muscles and of the larynx. Histories of each case are written up for the purpose of comparison and of locating family traits.

When a definite conception of the facts by the process just mentioned has been obtained then a study of the resonance of the individual's voice is begun. The use of the X-Ray is an indispensable factor in this study. And I may say that we find it most helpful in the study of the chest as well where there is a question about the action of the diaphragm or weakness due to a tubercular condition.

It is a well-known principle of physics that every vibration is best amplified by a resonator of definite capacity. We know that the vowels are sounded by the variation of the resonance chambers of the head. We know that the variable resonance cavities are the pharynx and the mouth. What are the fixed cavities?

The principal fixed cavity (by fixed I mean capable of no variation in size upon an act of the will) is the nasal passage, right and left. This is common knowledge. But do not the sinuses contribute resonance? At the anterior portion of the nasal passage, draining through the spongy ethmoid cells, is the frontal sinus. The connection between it and the nasal passage must be open for the health of the individual. The frontal sinus sometimes is absent, of course, but it exists in most persons and it varies in depth from 3 m.m. to 6 m.m. lateral view. The

anterior view shows a shape roughly like a triangle. The legs vary in length from 10 m.m. to 15 m.m. or more with the apex near the Crista Galli.

Then there are the sphenoids which open into the posterior portion of the nasal passage. They are shaped like and have a similar capacity to that of a small pecan nut. The sphenoid is readily observed upon the sciograph of a lateral view, just under the Sella Turcica.

The largest sinuses are the right and left Antra. They are located behind the cheek bones and somewhat over the double teeth. They connect with the nasal passages also.

The sizes of these sinuses vary considerably among individuals, and what may be of more importance, the thickness of the walls separating the cavities varies. I have found that there is an apparent variation in head resonance depending upon the sizes and shapes of the sinuses and the thinness of the partitions.

The most striking case is that of a girl who had been in our classes in public speaking for two and a half years with very little improvement in a voice quality that was decidedly unpleasant. All the exercises of the usual kind she practiced faithfully. She was much affected by colds in the winter time. A radiograph showed that no amount of training would ever give her a good voice. The chambers of resonance above the palates were shallow and narrow. Furthermore one antrum and part of another were filled with inflammation. Draining these would improve the quality but not yield the resonance of larger cavities.

Another case is that of a platform manager of Chautauquas. A year ago he developed a deadness of resonance together with a huskiness of tone. A record of his voice was made upon the phonograph. Then an analysis was made with the X-Ray. The result showed the antra and the frontal sinus inflamed. These were drained at the clinic and a record of his voice was again taken on the voice machine. The two records demonstrated difference in resonance. The hoarseness we found to be caused by a "singer's nodule" on the vocal cord. This was removed by a competent surgeon.

Another case in which a radiograph showed no frontal sinus and very small antra the excessive nasal quality of the voice

seemed due to large nasal passages without the modification apparently supplied by the presence of large sinuses.

The best quality of speaking voice possessed by any of our students seems to be that of a young woman who has taken several prizes in contest public speaking. A radiograph analysis of the sinuses of this case was made. The result showed unusually large antra, ethmoids, and sphenoids. The frontal sinus was large and deep.

A large number of cases have been studied in the laboratory and I hope later to make a more complete statement of the argument of the facts. If there is a definite relationship between the accessory sinuses and resonance we shall be able at the outset of a student's course to advise him as to the possibilities of a good speaking voice based upon the anatomical structure of the voice organs.

EDITORIAL

EXPERT JUDGES IN THE N. O. L.

AT THE annual contest of the Northern Oratorical League held at the University of Minnesota last May, expert judging was tried on what might be called a large scale. There are seven institutions in this league. Each had present a contestant and a faculty representative, the latter in each case a member of the department of public speaking. The customary board of judges was done away with, and the faculty representatives acted as the board, each man rating each contestant except his own. This meant that each judge rated six contestants just as if his own were not there, and each contestant received six ratings. The tabulated result, without the names, is given below. The speakers are represented by letters at the side and the judges by figures at the top. The blank spaces in the table show of course the professional relations of judges to students. Thus speaker C and judge 5 came from the same institution.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	Total	Rank
A.		4	5	5	5	2	2	23	5
B.	2	1	4	4	4		3	18	2
C.	1	2	1	1		1	1	7	1
D.	6	6	6	6	6	5		35	7
E.	4	3	2		1	4	6	20	4
F.	3	5		3	3	6	5	25	6
G.	5		3	2	2	3	4	19	3

This system was adopted after long consideration and much discussion. Its first trial has seemed to justify all that has been urged in favor of it by its advocates. In regard to the character of the decision itself, a glance at the table shows substantial unanimity for the first prize, and a close rating for the next three. On the whole, the table shows a very fair agreement on the part

of the judges, in the first and last places practically unanimous. There was very general and genuine satisfaction with the outcome of this contest. As far as the speakers are concerned they had the satisfaction of knowing that the rating was done by seven university department heads who must be admitted to be competent to do this sort of thing unless one wishes to deny their competence to hold the position which they are holding. It was an expert judgment rendered by a group of experts most interested in the correct decisions in this particular league. On that score this system seems to meet admirably all the tests, all the requirements of expert judging. It does away with the superficial guess work of the Honorable A and the Reverend B, who may or may not be competent judges.

The second great advantage of this system is the tremendous saving in the expenses of other judges. These faculty representatives always attend the contest anyway, their expenses being paid by their own institutions. In the past they have not judged the contest but instead the league has paid the expenses of five judges, many of whom have traveled considerable distances, it being impossible in a league of this size to get all of the judges from one locality. The expenses for traveling and entertaining the judges for the past contests have been from one hundred and fifty dollars to two hundred dollars. This great expense is completely eliminated by this faculty system of judging.

The two possible objections that we have heard urged against this scheme are these: In the first place, that university teachers of public speaking are not the best judges, that we need our standards *corrected* by judgments from the outside world, etc. But this one seems simply ridiculous. That the men who are teaching and coaching for these contests are not capable of rating the ability shown in the contest, seems to me cannot be held by one who believes them capable of performing their other duties; and that the group of seven department heads is less qualified than any other group of seven professional men is something we are not ready to admit. And, of course, we do not have our standards corrected when men who know practically nothing about speaking or speech composition render decisions which we know are quite absurd. We do not return to our universities and change our methods to square with such judgments.

So it seems to us that the statement that it is better not to have teachers of public speaking, but judges entirely outside of the profession, is hardly sufficient to throw out this scheme.

The second objection is that even though professional judges are good, these particular men would not be good because of their interest in the contest. In other words, that the fortunes of his own contestant would be uppermost in the mind of each judge and would make it impossible for him to rank the other six without considering his own. The concrete way in which this attitude on the part of the judge would work out would be this: Suppose a given judge should consider that the contest lay between his contestant and contestant X. He would not be grading his contestant and the honest way for him to do would be to give contestant X first place. If, however, he wanted to be dishonest in the matter and help his contestant to win, he would put contestant X, not in the first place, but in the sixth place. If any judge wanted to do that he might well do considerable damage. There seem to us, however, to be two guarantees against such a thing happening. First and foremost and entirely sufficient, is the character of the seven men who sit in judgment. There is not a man in the group who is cheap enough to do that sort of thing. They are simply above it, personally and professionally; and in the second place, the judgment of each man is known in detail and, of course, he must stand by it. The cards are signed by the judges; but if they were not signed, the blank space at which the column for the judge and the speaker coincide shows the identity of each judge.

A glance at this table shows that in this instance at least, no judge has tried to do that sort of thing, and we feel perfectly confident that no judge in the group will try to do it.

It seems that we have here a system which combines expert judging in the highest sense, greater interest on the part of the judges in the character of the decision to be rendered, the elimination of great expense, and the working out of a scheme by which actual standards may be set because the same men are judging year after year; thus improving, in our opinion, the whole atmosphere and educational service of this league.

The system is thus set forth in some detail in *THE QUARTERLY* because it has occurred to us that other leagues might like to try

it. We believe that it will work admirably in any league that has five contestants or more and might do very well even with three. The saving of expense and the expert character of the judgment ought to commend it to those in charge of any speaking contest. And if any teacher is in a league with some other teacher whom he would not trust to make a decision of this kind the only self-respecting thing to do is to cease relations with a man of that character. It seems much better, from all points of view, not to have contests in public speaking, than to have such contests carried on in an atmosphere of crookedness, suspicion, and duplicity.

THE THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE third annual convention of the National Association of Academic teachers of public speaking will be held in Chicago for a three-day period during the Christmas vacation. Every reader of *THE QUARTERLY* should make this fact known to all teachers of public speaking and professional men and women interested in speech problems. You should lay your plans now for being in attendance at this three-day convention. On account of the added time, the longer period, and the more leisurely programs which are planned we expect by far the largest and best convention of workers in this field ever held. We are at work in a big and growing field full of personal interest and possibilities of great social service. We are every year gaining a surer and higher place in the field of education. There will be in this largest and most detailed convention ever held something of interest and value for every worker in every section of the broad field of speech art and science. Every member of the Association should take a personal interest in making this convention a great success and should plan now to do something to give him a share in its success. Make plans for coming yourself. Speak to others in your locality about coming. Think over what you would like to hear discussed and send suggestions to President Lardner. There will be time enough in these three days to take up a great many questions. If you have one or two that you are especially interested in send them in now and you may be practi-

cally sure that they will appear on the program. Do not put this off as the program is now being arranged and all the details will be settled during the summer or early fall in order that complete information may appear in the October *QUARTERLY*. Send suggestions to President James L. Lardner, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

THE FORUM

VOICE AND ENLISTMENT

THE following clipping as published in the Rochester, New York, *Post Express* for June 12, 1917, ought to be of interest to teachers of Voice.

VOICE NO BAR TO ENLISTMENT

Soprano Changed to Bass by Recruiting Surgeon

MAN ACCEPTED AFTER A TEST

VOCAL GYMNASTICS AND INSTRUCTION IN BREATHING MAKE APPLICANT FIT FOR NAVY

Falsetto voices are no bar to enlistment in the United States navy at the Rochester recruiting station, for Surgeon William J. Rogers has devised a method of eliminating the boy soprano tones from the aspirant for service afloat and reducing the vocal exhalations to that deep note which is essential to the well being of a jack tar. Readiness to meet any emergency has been inculcated as the guiding principle of the sailor's life. When a girlish-toned, big physiqued young man confronted Surgeon Rogers to-day and asked for examination preliminary to enlistment, his training stood him in good stead,

"Why the feminine voice?" he inquired.

"I have always talked this way," was the strident response of the applicant.

"Then it is about time you talked in different fashion," was the surgeon's comment.

By this time the other members of the recruiting staff were listening to the unwonted high-pitched voice, unusual at the recruiting station. Speculation as to what would happen to a man with a voice like that acknowledging the receipt of some order and trying to live with hundreds of sailors was not one bit vague or indefinite. A throat examination showed no defects.

"What you need is some vocal gymnastics," prescribed the surgeon.

Then followed a scene novel to navy recruiting stations. Voice placing apparatus were demonstrated to him in detail, and when he left a short time later, an accepted candidate for the service, his voice was deep-toned enough for service on a submarine.

A SPEAKERS' TRAINING CAMP

A SPEAKERS' TRAINING CAMP is something new over in our Democracy, where new ideas are coming up all the time. Chautauqua, N. Y., from July 2 to July 7 was the scene of such a camp. This movement was the out-growth of the conviction of the National Security League that something was needed to arouse the American people to a sense of their patriotic duties in this time of national crisis.

In the language of the League the object of the meeting was stated as being an effort "to coördinate the rank of patriotic education and define the methods to be adopted by the speakers who will engage in a nation-wide campaign to bring to the American people a realization of the meaning of the war and the means necessary for its conduct." To accomplish the object just stated many public sessions were occupied with the discussion of matter to be presented and the manner of the presentation under varied circumstances and with varied audiences.

To a man interested in his country's welfare at this time this was an important conference. The councils of defense from twenty-seven states were represented by delegates; fifty-one colleges and universities sent men to represent them; and one hundred other organizations were interested enough to send men and women to take part in the deliberations. On the ground were historians, political scientists, ex-governors, college presidents, ministers, reformers, journalists, scientists, and just plain citizens. The general slogan was: Give information and arouse America! Enthusiasm for patriotism and an organized effort to make this patriotism of service to the government were the net results of the conference.

There is no class of men and women in America who ought to be more interested in the work outlined by this Speakers' Training Camp than those who teach Public Speaking. Here is

their chance to do some constructive work. Get in touch with that branch of the National Security League in your state that is starting a movement to educate the people for patriotic service. Learn what you can do.

If there is no Security League in your state write to the Executive Secretary of the National League, 31 Pine Street, New York. Tell him who you are and that you can make a speech for patriotism. Ask him what you can do. Tell him you are willing to use your time and energy to assist in the cause of national defense. This Secretary will send you full information as to how you may make your contribution. If the Public Speaking teachers ever had a chance to do a real, honest piece of work it is in this cause of educating for patriotic service.

C. D. H.

PERIODICALS

IN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CLINIC of February 15, 1917, there appeared an article, "Retarded School Children in Madison, Wisconsin," by Smiley Blanton, M.D., of the University of Wisconsin. The author made a survey of the schools of Madison, Wisconsin, to determine the number of children who, without adequate cause, were three years behind their grade.

1. All those who were retarded because of absence from school duty due to illness.

2. Those who lived in the country where school facilities were actually lacking or very poor.

3. Those who traveled about a great deal and had lost several years in changing from school to school or those who had been irregular in attendance due to illness were excluded.

Twelve schools were visited in which the aggregate attendance was 3631. Of this number 105 cases or 2.9% were three or more years behind their classes. The 105 cases were classified under five heads, as follows:

1. Feeble-mindedness. Due to heredity and conditions at birth and early infancy.

2. Dulness. Due to same cause.

3. Backwardness. Due to some abnormality of the internal secretions.

4. Specialized defects.

5. Neurosis, preventing the child from adjusting himself to the school curriculum.

The author says, "The problem of the dull and backward cases is different from that of the definitely feeble-minded. The backward cases can maintain themselves in society, if they are given an education fitted to their needs and mentality. Their failure to grasp the material taught in the ordinary school shows clearly that they are not receiving the education they need. The ordinary curriculum may be all right for the ordinary child, but these children, back-

ward and feeble-minded, get little benefit from it. They cannot grasp what the teacher is trying to teach them, and as a result they drop farther and farther behind their grades, and become discouraged with their almost constant failures. They hang on to their disagreeable tasks as long as the law compels them, and then drop out to fight life's battles without a training that has fitted them to make a living, and with mentality below the average. In most cases, unless the environment is very simple, failure awaits these cases no less than it does the feeble-minded. The tragedy of these backward cases is that they could have been saved from social failure by the proper training."

The author points out that the problem of backward and retarded children is one which must concern the teacher who deals with the correction of speech disorders. Many children have speech defects because of a defective intelligence and the teacher must be able to judge of the child's intelligence before she can choose the proper method of treatment. The author's conclusion is as follows:

"In every school system, there are from two to five per cent of the children who are not being educated, despite the best endeavors of the teachers. The reasons for this are not simple, but are quite complicated. The problem cannot be dismissed by saying that the child is lazy or that he receives no encouragement at home. Adequately to meet the problem of the backward and retarded child in the school requires the services of a trained psychologist, assisted at times by a competent neurologist who has had experience in dealing with neurotic and backward children. A psychological clinic should be a part of every school system that numbers as many as three or four thousand children. Such a clinic will really save money, for it will take a burden off the teachers and enable them to do more and better work with the normal children. The backward and feeble-minded should receive special training in special classes taught by specially trained teachers, the neurotic and those with specialized defects should be studied and given such treatment as needed. Often the principal is convinced that the child has need of special training but he has no authority to say that the child must be placed in a special class. If there were a trained psychologist to make the examination, the parents would be more likely to abide by the deci-

sion of the expert in mental examination. This mental testing should not consist of the Binet-Simon test alone, but should include as many other tests as may be necessary to form a decision concerning the child's mental ability in language and abstract subjects, as well as his motor control. In this way only can the backward and retarded children be saved from sure suffering and failure. A properly organized psychological clinic and special classes for the training of the backward are as necessary for the school as is medical inspection!"

PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSES IN STATE UNIVERSITIES, By V. A. KETCHAM, Ohio State University, in the *Educational Review*, February, 1917, pages 151-160

After pointing out the growing importance of public speaking courses in state universities and the establishment of separate departments of instruction in this field by the more progressive institutions such as Michigan and Wisconsin the writer says, "In most instances the development of the courses has been especially adapted to that training for citizenship which is the highest function of the state university. The emphasis has been most often placed upon courses designed to train the student to prepare and present original addresses, to speak extempore, and to debate effectively. He is taught to investigate political, social, and economic problems with a view to arriving at definite conclusions and making use of these conclusions when found. He is inspired with confidence by finding that his own conclusions, if based upon facts and sound in logic, are very trustworthy. This point of view cultivates a certain independence of thought which makes for good citizenship." . . . "There can be no surer guarantee of the continuance of democratic government than that any citizen, no matter how humble, may be trained to raise his voice in the councils of the community, state, and nation."

Emphasis is placed upon the part played by the spoken word in the development of our governmental institutions. Many illustrations are cited to show that in every great crisis in our history the orator has sounded the call to civic duty. The men who have been most successful in leading great political and social reforms have all been trained public speakers and most of

them had given especial attention to the art of public address. It is the especial duty of the state university to provide adequate training for those citizens who expect to enter public life for as James Bryce says in his *University and Historical Addresses* the duty of a state university is discharged in "furnishing skilled leaders in political and social movements."

The writer believes that there is a danger that this training for citizenship may be neglected in order to make more room for the material demands of the community. The tendency to emphasize technical courses, especially engineering and agriculture, seems to be retarding the development of liberal arts subjects and public speaking must necessarily suffer with other kindred departments of instruction.

That the opportunity for the properly trained public speaker to exercise an influence in our civic life is greater than at any previous period in our history is shown by the increased number and variety of opportunities opened to him. Not only in our political campaigns and in the speech-requiring professions but in all the activities of modern life have these opportunities multiplied. Good government and civic improvement associations have sprung up and developed until many of them are of national and even international scope. Church and school are making greater demands upon the layman for discussion and debate. Almost all of our great social, business, and professional organizations touch the well-being of the body politic in some aspect of their work. "President Wilson, in a recent address, declared that the discussions and debates held before local organizations of all kinds in every community throughout the land exert an influence upon public opinion which is incalculable."

"The popular cry of the day is—Preparedness. No aspect of this subject is more vital than preparation for citizenship. Much emphasis has been put upon training soldiers to obey and upon providing them with instruments for killing purposes, which training and provision are all that is necessary in an absolute monarchy. But in a democracy these same soldiers are presumed to have a voice in determining under what conditions they shall subject themselves to military discipline and make use of death-dealing instruments and in a matter so vital to them

that training to make effective their voices in matters of state would seem to be of even greater importance than the training for war itself. To argue otherwise is to argue for government by the few instead of the many, for aristocracy instead of democracy."

The importance of training in the art of public address as an effective aid in solving the complex national and international problems which face us is pointed out. "When we contemplate the immensity of this field for work which is open to the properly trained and equipped public speaker and when we consider how much unworthy and inefficient speaking is done by otherwise capable men in the assemblages and councils which determine our public opinion and action we can not longer express surprize at the slowness of our civic and moral progress."

"While public speaking courses have developed until they are playing a vastly more important part in our civic life than is apparent on the surface their usefulness must be greatly augmented if the most vital function of the state university is to be performed."

NEW BOOKS

Adenoids and Tonsils. BY ALGERNON COOLIDGE, M.D.: Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1916. Cloth, price 50 cents.

There was published recently by the Harvard University Press, a short and helpful book, *Adenoids and Tonsils* by Dr. Algernon Coolidge, professor of laryngology in Harvard Medical School.

The teacher of voice and public speaking is often perplexed by the conflicting reports concerning the effects upon the voice and speech of enlarged adenoids and diseased tonsils. In this short brochure can be obtained a precise correct and scientific view of the matter. The author discusses the abnormal conditions of the adenoids and summarizes the matter as follows:

"Adenoids means a disturbance of the adenoid gland. Generally an enlargement of it but sometimes a disease of the tissue. The most frequent harm that it does is to prevent a child from getting the proper amount of air through the nose, and this may cause the child to suffer in many ways. *If the child is suffering from adenoids, they should be removed.*"

In discussing the tonsils the author points out that the exact function of the tonsils is not known but that nature probably gave them to us for a purpose and they should be retained so long as possible. But he says that when a person's tonsils are a menace to health the only sure and satisfactory treatment is to remove them. Authorities agree "that tonsils should be removed for recurring abscesses of the throat, for persistent and enlarged glands of the neck that cannot be accounted for by some other cause, for frequent attacks of tonsillitis, for very large tonsils, and in those cases in which it is suspected that serious constitutional disease is caused by diseases focused in the tonsils."

S. B.